BEFORE THE

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
REGULAR MONTHLY BUSINESS)
MEETING)
)

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

January 26, 2000

9:30 A.M.

8800 Cal Center Drive Sacramento, California

REPORTED BY: Terri L. Emery, CSR No. 11598

- 1 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, JANUARY 26, 2000 9:30 A.M.
- 2 * * * * *
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Morning, everyone. Left
- 4 out the word "good" for personal reasons, but welcome
- 5 back. We're back to our second day of our January Board

- 6 meeting.
- 7 For those of you who weren't here yesterday
- 8 and heard the various announcements, in the back there are
- 9 speaker slips. If you wish to speak on any item on
- 10 today's remaining agenda, if you'll kindly fill out that
- 11 slip and hand it to Ms. Dominguez, it will be duly
- 12 processed so we can hear from you.
- In addition, I will begin on my left with
- 14 ex partes, but before I do, I did receive and I think most
- 15 Members, if you haven't received it received another
- 16 letter from Jerry Jamgotchian regarding the matter on
- 17 Hawthorne. And so for purposes of all of us, I'll just
- 18 put that as an ex parte to all of us.
- Mr. Pennington.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Yes,
- 21 Mr. Chairman. One, I'm here. And two, I have no other ex
- 22 partes other than the one you just mentioned.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: You're absolutely right,
- 24 Mr. Pennington. It's been few too many hours. I just
- 25 thought we were in recess. I probably should establish a

6

- 1 quorum on the roll.
- 2 Madam Secretary, would you please call the
- 3 roll. Thank you for reminding me.
- 4 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Here.
- 6 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Here.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Here.
- 10 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Here.
- 12 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Here. Thank you.
- Mr. Jones.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Thank you,
- 16 Mr. Chairman. Yeah, I got the fax from Jerry Jamgotchian.
- 17 I also had a brief discussion with Mike Mohajer on the --
- 18 some of the southern California issues and a brief
- 19 discussion with Mr. Cupps.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Yes. I did
- 21 forget to mention that I had an exchange with Mr. Cupps
- 22 over my tie.
- 23 (Laughter)
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I hope it was
- 25 amicable.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I have no
- 3 new ones other than what you mentioned.
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: Senator Roberti.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: No ex partes.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: I also had a brief
- 7 encounter of the third kind with Mr. Cupps --
- 8 (Laughter)
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: And a meet-and-greet with
- 10 Peter Weiner today.
- 11 In addition, for those of you who may not
- 12 have stayed to the late hours last evening, today as per
- 13 the agenda we will start off with Agenda Item Number 3,
- 14 which is a public hearing for the consideration of the
- 15 appeal of denial of the waste tire hauler registration for
- 16 MB Opportunities, Waste Tire Hauler Number 0107.
- 17 Upon completion of that item, we will then
- 18 pick up on the agenda where we left off last evening, and
- 19 we left off after completing Item Number 35, and we will
- 20 start with Item Number 36 and proceed to finish the agenda
- 21 in the order as it is set forth in the agenda that was
- 22 publicly noticed. So if we have no further comments or
- 23 reports, we can begin with Item Number 3.
- 24 Before we do, I have a brief introductory
- 25 statement that we are now going to open the public hearing

- 1 for MB Opportunities regarding denial of a waste tire
- 2 hauler registration. The format of this hearing will
- 3 follow the general procedures previously adopted by this
- 4 Board. First, the court reporter will swear in the
- 5 witnesses, then the Board staff will present its case. It
- 6 will be followed by MB Opportunities presenting their
- 7 case. Thereafter, upon completion of that presentation by
- 8 each side, each side will then have ten minutes for
- 9 rebuttal.
- 10 Once each side has presented its case, the
- 11 Board Members here may ask questions and the Board's role
- 12 will be that of a finder of fact, similar to that of a
- 13 jury. Any questions should be limited to the evidence
- 14 presented at today's hearing. Our deliberations will
- 15 occur on the record after the case is presented and if
- 16 there are no further questions. After such deliberations
- 17 here in public, we will announce our decision.
- 18 With that I ask that the hearing begin.
- 19 Mr. Fitzgerald.
- MR. FITZGERALD: Mr. Chairman, before the
- 21 formal hearing begins and swearing in, I would just like
- 22 to make a few comments on the tire enforcement program to
- 23 put this in perspective.
- 24 The enforcement program has been pretty
- 25 much staff driven. Most of the actions that take place

- 1 take place outside of the Board hearings instead of the
- 2 administrative level. The goal of the program has been
- 3 compliance, to get the sites cleaned up. In the last five
- 4 years we've been very successful in this. We've inspected
- 5 over 461 sites. They've issued -- it hasn't been a paper
- 6 tiger program by any stretch of the imagination. There
- 7 have been 265 C and A orders, and 32 criminal complaints
- 8 have been issued in the last five years.
- 9 So basically we've done an excellent job in
- 10 cleaning up. We haven't done quite as good a job in
- 11 keeping the Board apprised of how the program has
- 12 functioned and where we're going on this, and so I would
- 13 like to touch on a couple of things that we're going to do
- 14 in the future that will bring the Board more into the
- 15 picture and give you a better understanding of what this
- 16 program is.
- We've started meeting -- for example, the
- 18 staff started meeting with the Legal Office every two
- 19 weeks and we're going through each of the infractions that
- 20 we find throughout the program in detail so everyone
- 21 understands what's going on within the staff. We're going
- 22 to review our procedures to make certain that the two key
- 23 elements, fairness and consistency, are improved
- 24 throughout the program. We haven't had major problems at
- 25 all, but we want to fine tune it. Once we finish this

- 1 effort, we want to come back before the Board and let you
- 2 know what it is so you can -- we can get your input on the
- 3 program and make any adjustments that the Board feels
- 4 that's necessary. So basically we want a better Board
- 5 participation and understanding of the program and I'm
- 6 certain you share that.
- Now, the particular hearing we have today I
- 8 would like to put it in perspective. There are 800
- 9 haulers registered within the state of California.
- 10 Annually they have to renew their registration the first
- 11 of the year. This year we sent out ten letters to
- 12 different haulers that we were not going to renew their
- 13 registration. Six of those haulers we had negotiated with
- 14 and cleared up the issues that caused us to issue those
- 15 letters. There are still four haulers in the state that
- 16 have letters of non-issuance of permits. Two of those
- 17 four have appealed, and one of those appeals is what
- 18 you'll be hearing today. So 800 haulers, two appeals, and
- 19 that's where we are today.
- 20 So without further adieu, I'll turn it over
- 21 to Lynda Williams so she can start the hearing.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you for the delicacy
- 23 of handling the situation so we wouldn't have any facts
- 24 that would be put into evidence without being sworn in and
- 25 just giving us the procedural nature of these types of

- 1 cases.
- 2 If we could have the legal considerations
- 3 and opening statements by Lynda Williams who is staff
- 4 counsel. Before you're ready to begin, is there a
- 5 representative here from MB Opportunities?
- 6 MR. BALL: Yeah, me.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Great. Thank you very
- 8 much.
- 9 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Chairman Eaton.
- 10 Good morning, Members of the Board. I'm going to give a
- 11 brief overview of what you'll be hearing this morning in
- 12 the way of evidence regarding the denial of a registration
- 13 for Waste Tire Hauler Number 0107, MB Opportunities, also
- 14 known as Michael Ball.
- 15 The California Integrated Waste Management
- 16 Board has the authority to inspect, permit, regulate and
- 17 conduct enforcement actions against waste tire facilities
- 18 and waste tire haulers pursuant to Public Resources Code
- 19 Section 42800 et seq, and also attending regulations
- 20 contained in Title 14 of the California Code of
- 21 Regulations.
- 22 Michael Ball, owner and operator of MB
- 23 Opportunities, became a registered waste tire hauler by
- 24 the California Integrated Waste Management Board on or
- 25 about November 3rd of 1994. He owns and operates the

- 1 hauling business and is responsible for waste tires that
- 2 have recently been deposited in the past year, 1999, at
- 3 his mother's residence at 18231 West Clinton Road in
- 4 Jackson. This site, as you will hear, is not a permitted
- 5 waste tire facility.
- 6 On June 17th, 1999, Mr. Cambridge and
- 7 Mr. Cody Begley, both of the California Integrated Waste
- 8 Management Board, investigated the site at West Clinton
- 9 Road and documented several violations. You'll hear that
- 10 these violations, mostly out of the California Code of
- 11 Regulations, include violation of provision for adequate
- 12 fire prevention, adequate facility access and site
- 13 security, adequate vector controls, and inappropriate
- 14 storage of waste tires.
- 15 Mr. Cambridge will tell you that he
- 16 estimated that approximately or at least 7,000 waste tires
- 17 or tire equivalents were being stored at the property at
- 18 the time of his inspection. The act of depositing the
- 19 waste tires at the site is a violation of Public Resources
- 20 Code Section 42951, sub B. Now, in the binders that you
- 21 have before you, I have attached copies of the code
- 22 sections and the statutes that will be referred to during
- 23 the course of this hearing, and I believe you'll find
- 24 those behind black tab number 2.
- 25 On the second page, 42951 sub B states

- 1 specifically that a registered waste tire hauler who
- 2 transports waste tires to a facility that is not a waste
- 3 tire facility as defined in Section 42808, or a landfill
- 4 pursuant to 42866, or a facility that is authorized to
- 5 accept waste tires pursuant to a state or local agency
- 6 permit, or a facility which lawfully accepts waste tires
- 7 for reuse or disposal shall be subject to the civil
- 8 penalty to be imposed under Section 42962.
- 9 So essentially what you'll hear today is
- 10 that Michael Ball, operating as MB Opportunities, violated
- 11 this section by hauling, using his registration, waste
- 12 tires to an unpermitted or unauthorized facility.
- 13 What I propose at this time to do is to
- 14 call Investigator Keith Cambridge who has prepared a
- 15 presentation. You'll find the color copies of his
- 16 presentation attached also in your binders at black tab 7,
- 17 almost to the end of your binders.
- 18 And with that, I will turn it over to
- 19 Mr. Cambridge.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Williams, how many
- 21 witnesses will you be having?
- 22 MS. WILLIAMS: I anticipate calling also
- 23 Amalia Fernandez and Cody Begley very briefly just to
- 24 describe the hauler registration process.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: If it meets with your

- 1 approval and Mr. Ball's approval, I would like to be able
- 2 to swear in all of the witnesses now in one procedure. I
- 3 assume you will be testifying as well as a witness, so if
- 4 you wouldn't mind I'll swear you all in at the same time
- 5 for purposes of efficiency in this proceeding. So if you
- 6 will kindly raise your right hand and the court reporter
- 7 will swear you in.
- 8 BOARD REPORTER: Do you solemnly swear that
- 9 the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth,
- 10 the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.
- 11 (All witnesses answer in the affirmative)
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. You may
- 13 proceed.
- 14 MR. BEGLEY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and
- 15 Members of the Board. What I'm going to show you on the
- 16 screen is basically a chronological order of the West
- 17 Clinton Road waste tire site and chronological summary of
- 18 the events that have taken place with that site. The
- 19 first picture, please.
- 20 On April 1st, 1996, Michael Keffer and I,
- 21 accompanied by Margaret Blood of the Amador County Health
- 22 Department, conducted a waste tire facility inspection at
- 23 18231 West Clinton Road, Jackson, California, hereinafter
- 24 known as West Clinton Road waste tire site. At that time
- 25 I estimated that at least 7,000 waste tires were being

- 1 stored on this property. That same day, Mr. Keffer,
- 2 Ms. Blood and I conducted another waste tire facility
- 3 inspection located at 11941 Highway 88, Martel,
- 4 California,
- 5 hereinafter known as the Fine and Sons waste tire site.
- 6 Mr. Ball was responsible for the storage of more than
- 7 10,000 waste tires and tire equivalents at this location.
- 8 On September 26th, 1996, Administrative
- 9 Complaint Number 9629-A was issued to Mr. Ball concerning
- 10 the West Clinton Road waste tire site and the failure to
- 11 remove the waste tires from this location. After the
- 12 hearing, the tires were removed by Mr. Ball.
- On July 22nd, 1997, Administrative
- 14 Complaint Number 9724-AC was issued to Mr. Ball concerning
- 15 the Fine and Sons waste tire site and the failure to
- 16 remove the tires from this location as well. Once again,
- 17 Mr. Ball, after the hearing, removed the tires.
- 18 These following three pictures will depict
- 19 the West Clinton Road waste tire site which is a
- 20 residential property located up in the outside of Jackson,
- 21 California. During this time we had estimated
- 22 approximately 7,000 tires being stored in the backyard of
- 23 this property. Next slide, again another picture of the
- 24 property. Next picture.
- 25 This is an overall view taken from a small

- 1 water aqueduct above. To the far left-hand corner -- up
- 2 in the top left-hand corner you can see the residence and
- 3 the backyard is completely full of tires. Next picture
- 4 please.
- 5 On June 17th, 1999, Cody Begley and myself,
- 6 as a result of the complaint from the Amador County Health
- 7 Department, conducted another inspection of the West
- 8 Clinton Road waste tire site. My rough estimate showed
- 9 that approximately 7,000 waste tires, mostly tire
- 10 equivalents, were again being stored at this property. A
- 11 letter of violation dated June 17th, 1999 was addressed
- 12 and posted by U.S. mail to Mr. Ball concerning the
- 13 deposition of waste tires at the West Clinton Road waste
- 14 tire site and required that the tires be removed by August
- 15 1st, 1999.
- On July 22nd, 1999, I conducted another
- 17 site visit by myself and Mr. Begley, and a more accurate
- 18 number of tires were estimated to be approximately 11,300
- 19 waste tire equivalents. And I mention equivalents because
- 20 the majority of the tires are basically pieces of waste
- 21 tire treads that he had stacked on the site.
- 22 On August -- on July 26th, a letter was
- 23 addressed and posted by U.S. mail to Mr. Ball granting him
- 24 until September 1st, 1999 to remove the waste tires and
- 25 tire shreds from this location. On August -- can I have

- 1 the other picture please.
- On August 19th, 1999, a letter was
- 3 addressed and posted by U.S. mail to Mr. Ball, once again,
- 4 granting him one more time extension from September 1st,
- 5 1999 to September 17th, 1999 per his request for the
- 6 removal of the waste tires. On September 7th, 1999, a
- 7 letter was received from Mr. Ball requesting yet another
- 8 time extension to October 1st, 1999. The letter was
- 9 addressed and posted to Mr. Ball denying the extension of
- 10 time on this particular request.
- 11 On September 30th, 1999 another letter was
- 12 received by Mr. Ball requesting another time extension to
- 13 October 20th, 1999. Again, this was denied by the Waste
- 14 Board. Can I have the next picture, please.
- On December 28th, 1999 I conducted a site
- 16 visit of the site and it revealed less than 500 tires on
- 17 the property at this time. The operator submitted
- 18 manifests for all the tire shreds -- or tire equivalents
- 19 that were removed from the site and the operator's
- 20 estimation was approximately 30,000-plus tire equivalents
- 21 or 343 tons which had been removed to a landfill. Can I
- 22 have the next picture, please.
- 23 This depicts the pictures of what we had
- 24 seen out during the June and July site visits of the site.
- 25 The operator was cutting up the tires, taking the

- 1 sidewalls, I believe, for silage covers and the remainder
- 2 of the tires were being stacked in this fashion. He was
- 3 trying to provide some sort of stability to his aqueduct,
- 4 feeling that this was a lawful use of the tires. Next
- 5 picture, another shot of the tires against the aqueduct.
- 6 Next picture. Next picture. Next picture.
- 7 This is the aqueduct up on top that apparently was, I
- 8 guess, from the operator's statement leaking in a few
- 9 places and the reason for him placing all these tires
- 10 against the aqueduct.
- Basically this concludes my presentation.
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of
- 13 Mr. Begley?
- 14 MS. WILLIAMS: If I may ask a few
- 15 questions.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure. Please.
- 17 MS. WILLIAMS: Is the override still on my
- 18 mike?
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think it just hasn't
- 20 been turned on because ours are working.

21

- 22 EXAMINATION
- 23 BY MS. WILLIAMS:
- Q. Mr. Cambridge, I know it's difficult. You
- 25 can't see me. Did you note that the tires were stored in

- 1 any way to violate any other portions of the California
- 2 Code of Regulations?
- 3 A. Basically at that time he was -- the
- 4 violations noted were site security, storage of waste tire
- 5 regulations, which is Section 17354 of the Title 14, and
- 6 vector control, and I believe fire prevention measures.
- 7 He may have had some fire equipment measures on the site.
- 8 Q. How, for example, did you assess that this
- 9 storage violated any portion, for example, of the fire
- 10 prevention measures which were not at the site? Do you
- 11 recall?
- 12 A. Could you repeat the question?
- 13 Q. Of the four sections that you just
- 14 mentioned under 17351, failure to provide adequate fire
- 15 prevention measures which were not at the site.
- 16 A. I believe he did not have a pike pole, and
- 17 I believe he had shovels but I did not see a fire
- 18 extinguisher on the site.
- 19 Q. And regarding 17352, the access and
- 20 security?
- 21 A. There was no fencing or any sort of
- 22 prevention from intrusion onto the property.
- 23 Q. Is there any violation of vector control?
- 24 A. There is -- basically when we go out to a
- 25 site we establish -- we did not see the mosquito breeding.

- 1 However, if you do not have a vector control measure in
- 2 place you're in violation of that unless you have written
- 3 approval from the local vector control authority.
- 4 Q. And to your knowledge have you seen or did
- 5 he present any vector control authority sign-offs to you?
- A. No, he did not.
- 7 Q. And finally, there's a violation for
- 8 storage. And can you specify exactly how that section is
- 9 violated?
- 10 A. Yes. Basically the storage of waste tires,
- 11 the tires were stored next to vegetative growth and
- 12 basically that is the main problem we had there.
- 13 Q. So essentially this was -- despite the
- 14 respondent's perception this was a lawful storage, it was
- 15 at a minimum an unsafe storage of the tires?
- 16 A. Correct.
- MS. WILLIAMS: I have nothing further.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions?
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I have a couple of
- 22 questions.

23

- 24 EXAMINATION
- 25 BY BOARD MEMBER JONES:

- 1 Q. The first tire piles that we saw was the
- 2 deal we had already dealt with when we issued the order
- 3 and the fines; right?
- 4 A. That's correct. That was in '96 and he
- 5 cleaned up the site.
- 6 Q. So that site was void of tires. He
- 7 completed that one. He got all those tires out?
- 8 A. That's correct.
- 9 Q. These were new tires that came in?
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. There was a picture -- I don't know if
- 12 Terry can bring it back. There was a picture two or three
- 13 back. I have a question on our -- and I want this -- I
- 14 want to make sure that we -- does this fall into the realm
- 15 of a civil engineering project for shreds and --
- MR. CAMBRIDGE: We never received an
- 17 application or a plan and I checked with the County of
- 18 Amador and they hadn't either. I met the LEA out there
- 19 and Mr. Ball claimed that he was going to build a
- 20 retaining wall out of the shreds and the County had
- 21 approved it and he had not been able to verify that and we
- 22 have never seen any civil engineering plan.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That was my next
- 24 question. Was it an engineered -- you don't know if it
- 25 was an engineered use.

- 1 MR. CAMBRIDGE: We -- he never submitted a
- 2 plan to us so we don't know.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll ask the question
- f 4 later when f Mr. Ball is up because f I just want to make sure
- 5 that we're -- we have two tracks that we go down, and
- 6 civil engineering projects are one that we promote. And I
- 7 just want to make sure that the criteria we set forward
- 8 for civil engineering projects haven't been overlooked.
- 9 And I'm not saying they are, but that's why we're having a
- 10 hearing.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any other questions? I
- 12 have just a couple. My understanding is that he was -- MB
- 13 Opportunities was granted an extension of time from
- 14 approximately July 26th, 1999 to September 1st, 1999,
- 15 according to your testimony.
- MR. BEGLEY: That's correct. That was the
- 17 first deadline we gave him.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: During that time were any
- 19 of the tires or tire shreds removed during that period of
- 20 time that you're aware of?
- 21 MR. BEGLEY: Yes. I believe that some
- 22 tires were removed. However, Mr. Ball was running into
- 23 complications, whether breakdown of vehicles or financial
- 24 means, I believe. I'll let him explain that a little bit
- 25 later, but he requested I believe four different time

- 1 extensions. And the problem with time extensions were
- 2 they were two or three weeks apart versus a larger
- 3 segment, so that's why we gave him a couple of time
- 4 extensions extending it to a reasonable time.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: During those requests, did
- 6 you have an opportunity to visit that site during those
- 7 times?
- 8 MR. BEGLEY: Not between --
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: September 1st, I think;
- 10 correct?
- MR. BEGLEY: Right. And December 28th.
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: And it was on December
- 13 28th that you were able to --
- 14 MR. BEGLEY: Verify that the tires had been
- 15 removed.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. Any other
- 17 questions?
- 18 Ms. Williams, your next witness.
- 19 MS. WILLIAMS: My next questions are for
- 20 Amalia Hernandez.

21

- 22 EXAMINATION
- 23 BY MS. WILLIAMS:
- Q. Ms. Fernandez, by whom are you currently
- 25 employed?

- 1 A. My name is Amalia Fernandez and I'm
- 2 currently employed by the California Integrated Waste
- 3 Management Board Waste Tire Management Branch of the
- 4 Special Waste Division.
- 5 Q. And what are your responsibilities?
- 6 A. I'm responsible for the waste tire hauler
- 7 program. As such, I'm custodian of the records for the
- 8 waste tire hauler program.
- 9 Q. And as a part of your duties, did you
- 10 review the record regarding MB Opportunities today?
- 11 A. Yes, I did.
- 12 Q. And can you tell us when was the first time
- 13 that Mr. Ball operating as MB Opportunities first received
- 14 a registration from the Board?
- 15 A. On or around November 3rd, 1994.
- 16 Q. And has he operated every year annually
- 17 since that time?
- 18 A. Yes. He has renewed the registration as
- 19 required by regulations.
- Q. Regarding the year for 1999, are you aware
- 21 of whether he was -- did he submit an application?
- 22 A. Yes, he did. Board staff received an
- 23 application for renewal on October 18th, 1999 from \mbox{MB}
- 24 Opportunities for the year 2000.
- 25 Q. And do you -- are you aware of whether a

- 1 response was issued regarding that application?
- 2 A. Yes, I am. On November 3rd, Board staff
- 3 sent a letter to MB Opportunities denying the year 2000
- 4 waste tire hauler registration.
- 5 Q. I'll just show you a copy. Is this the
- 6 letter?
- 7 A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Okay.
- 9 MS. WILLIAMS: Do you want to mark these
- 10 and --
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure. And if you could
- 12 just for identification purposes for the record indicate
- 13 that it's a letter from --
- MS. WILLIAMS: From the Board?
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: From the individual, that
- 16 would be helpful. Mark that as Exhibit 1.
- 17 MS. WILLIAMS: So I ask that Exhibit 1 be
- 18 marked, and that is the letter from the Board to Mr. Ball
- 19 on December 3rd, 1999 indicating that his waste tire
- 20 hauler registration would not be renewed.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Ball would have a copy
- 22 of that letter? Are you -- okay.
- MR. BALL: Did I get a copy of it? Yes.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Ball, in case he
- 25 doesn't have a copy of that letter.

- 1 Q. BY MS. WILLIAMS: And do you know whether
- 2 or not a hearing was held regarding the denial of that
- 3 waste tire hauler registration for 1999?
- A. It's being held today on January 26th, year
- 5 2000.
- 6 Q. Was there a previous hearing for his 1999
- 7 hauler registration?
- 8 A. Oh, I see. Yes. There was a hearing in
- 9 February of 1999 --
- 10 Q. Okay.
- 11 A. -- for it, the same type of action for
- 12 denying --
- 13 Q. Okay.
- 14 A. -- the waste tire hauler registration.
- 15 Q. And do you recall what were the grounds for
- 16 denying the waste tire hauler registration?
- 17 A. Yes, I do.
- 18 Q. What were those grounds?
- 19 A. I believe it was for storing tires at an
- 20 unpermitted facility.
- 21 Q. Okay.
- 22 MS. WILLIAMS: I'd like at this time -- I
- 23 do not at this moment have further questions for
- 24 Ms. Hernandez. I would just like to refer the Board
- 25 Members to -- it's, I believe, black tab number 5. It's

- 1 the amended statement and memorandum in support of this
- 2 action, and all the white tabs that you see behind that
- 3 are attachments, and these attachments are pretty much --
- 4 they substantiate the history of MB Opportunities
- 5 regarding enforcement actions with the Board and I just
- 6 want to walk you briefly through them.
- 7 They tell a pretty quick story, and they
- 8 are all referenced in the amended statement of memorandum
- 9 which I will be presenting in closing arguments, but for
- 10 the Board's reference, Cleanup and Abatement Order Number
- 11 9622 is attached at white tab number 1. That was issued
- 12 in 1996 regarding the West Clinton Road waste tire site to
- 13 which Mr. Cambridge has earlier testified when
- 14 approximately 7,000 tire equivalents were being stored
- 15 unpermitted at that site.
- 16 The administrative complaint that was
- 17 subsequently issued is attached at white tab 2. That's
- 18 Administrative Complaint 9629-A. A decision pursuant to
- 19 stipulation was issued. That's attached at white tab 3
- 20 for that West Clinton site.
- 21 Also in 1996, attached at white tab 4, a
- 22 Cleanup and Abatement Order, Number 9640, was issued for
- 23 the Fine and Sons site as testified to by Mr. Cambridge.
- 24 That Cleanup and Abatement Order was not observed and
- 25 ultimately resulted in Administrative Complaint 9724-AC.

- 1 That's attached at white tab 5. The Administrative
- 2 Judge's decision for that AC is attached at white tab 6.
- 3 A November 17th letter, 1998, addressed to Mr. Ball and
- 4 signed by Keith Cambridge, informing him of the violations
- 5 at the West Clinton Road site is attached at white tab 7.
- 6 White tab 8 is a December 29th letter and from -- signed
- 7 by Cody Begley for Bernard Vlach denying the renewal of
- 8 Waste Tire Hauler 1007 is at white tab 8.
- 9 And then the resolution that resulted in
- 10 the hearing that was held, I believe, on February 3rd,
- 11 1999 is attached at white tab number 9. I'm sorry. It
- 12 may be February 23rd. And finally, the report referenced
- 13 by Mr. Cambridge, which is a letter also of violation that
- 14 was mailed to Mary Ball and Michael Ball for the most
- 15 recently documented violations at the West Clinton Road
- 16 site.
- 17 For the sake of simplicity, Mr. Chairman, I
- 18 would like that these be marked as State's Exhibit 2 with
- 19 the sub-attachments.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: That would be fine. While
- 21 we're doing that, do the Board Members have any questions
- 22 of, first off, Ms. Fernandez? She was -- Senator Roberti.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes. Just a couple
- 24 of points to clarify. Mr. Ball is here asking for a new
- 25 permit. What I'm interested in is what Mr. Ball did to

- 1 clean up this site or did he violate any order since he
- 2 was last here. From what I understand, the site is now
- 3 clean but it took a little while. It took longer than
- 4 what we had requested. So I would like to know from both
- 5 our staff and Mr. Ball what the reason for that is. Then
- 6 the other point is was there any reimportation of tires to
- 7 any site.
- 8 MS. WILLIAMS: With the Senator's
- 9 permission -- I'm sorry.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes. Those are the
- 11 two questions in my mind, not that everything else isn't
- 12 important, but those are important because it goes to
- 13 Mr. Ball's intent after he was last here before the Board
- 14 as to whether he's been trying to comply or whether he's
- 15 just disregarding us as an unnecessary nuisance.
- 16 That's --
- 17 MS. WILLIAMS: With the Senator's and the
- 18 Chairman's permission, I would like to ask which of the
- 19 witnesses wish to address that, and I ask that Mr. Ball
- 20 respond to that question during his case-in-chief.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Okay.
- 22 MR. CAMBRIDGE: Mr. Roberti, basically
- 23 since the last hearing we had -- Mr. Ball had the site
- 24 cleaned, or when we became aware of it again back in June
- 25 this last year in 1999, we then discovered that he had at

- 1 that time 7,000 to 11,000 waste tire equivalents or the
- 2 tire pieces located on the property.
- When we became aware of that, he was
- 4 compliant with us and did try to remove the tires due to
- 5 unforeseen circumstances as I previously mentioned.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: You're saying when
- 7 he became aware of it. He was not aware of the 7,000 to
- 8 11,000?
- 9 MR. CAMBRIDGE: No -- let me back up. He
- 10 was aware that he transported the tires there and put
- 11 these tires pieces there. When we became aware of the
- 12 site, we then told him he needed to remove the tires and
- 13 at that time he started removing the waste tires.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Were these tires
- 15 transported -- when were those tires transported to the
- 16 site?
- 17 MR. CAMBRIDGE: To the site or from the
- 18 site?
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: To the offending
- 20 place.
- 21 MR. CAMBRIDGE: I believe, according to
- 22 Mr. Ball, sometime between January and May or --
- 23 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Okay. That was
- 24 before he was here or that was after he was here?
- 25 MR. CAMBRIDGE: It was possibly a month

- 1 before and also after the time he was here. He was here
- 2 in February 1999.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: So all during that
- 4 time these tires were being --
- 5 MR. CAMBRIDGE: Brought to his location.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I quess we'll have
- 7 to ask him why. Were we ever made aware of those tires?
- 8 MR. CAMBRIDGE: Not until June with Amador
- 9 County Health Department receiving the complaint and we
- 10 investigated the site.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Mr. Chairman, would
- 12 it be proper to ask Mr. Ball while he was here -- it is
- 13 evidently alleged that there were 7,000 to 11,000 tires
- 14 being imported to a site that he had and we didn't know
- 15 about that. Maybe now is the time to ask Mr. Ball what
- 16 the reason for that was.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think we can dispense
- 18 with formalities and get right to the point.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yeah.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: If that meets with
- 21 stipulation from Counsel because you're absolutely right.
- 22 And I was just going back through the resolution prompted
- 23 by your questions. We had a certain set of conditions as
- 24 well.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Right.

32

- 1 MS. WILLIAMS: You'll need the podium.
- MR. BALL: It was my understanding --
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Kindly state your name for
- 4 the record.
- 5 MR. BALL: My name is Michael Ball --
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you.
- 7 MR. BALL: -- owner of MB Opportunities.
- 8 It was my understanding that as long as I kept under 500
- 9 tires on the property that there would be no problem,
- 10 according to Cambridge. The last time he came up and
- 11 checked me off he said as long as there's under 500 tires,
- 12 there would be no problem.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: He's saying there
- 14 was 7,000 to 11,000 tires.
- MR. BALL: Yeah. Well, let's get to that
- 16 next. Okay. So at that point we kept under 500 tires and
- 17 operated. Usually my sidewalls would go to the dairies.
- 18 The rest would go to Sacramento landfill or whatever else
- 19 we could get going. We took some down to Westley, down to
- 20 MELP, and at that time I asked Margaret Blood at the
- 21 County. I said have you got a problem with me building
- 22 this retaining wall up against this ditch? She goes well,
- 23 nobody really cares about this thing. If no one has got
- 24 any objections, then we started doing that at that point.
- We did ask her, and we also asked the

- 1 Supervisor of Amador County, Louis Boytano, and he came up
- 2 and personally looked at it. I was clean -- doing a
- 3 cleanup for him. Shortly after my license was reinstated,
- 4 we jumped right to a cleanup on his property and I told
- 5 him about my project, and he said well, you're in a gray
- 6 area there. I said well, I think I might be. He said we
- 7 don't want our tires going there. So not all tires that
- 8 we collected went there.
- 9 I told each one of my customers what I was
- 10 doing and the ones that said okay, we took it there. We
- 11 thought we were legal. We didn't know that there -- I
- 12 even --
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Did Amador County
- 14 give you any official clearance?
- MR. BALL: Not on paper, and to this date
- 16 they said what's going on with you, and I said well, right
- 17 now my license is being yanked. They said well, you get
- 18 it all straightened out and we'll work with you on it.
- 19 We'll do it.
- 20 I had that thing engineered by an engineer
- 21 and he came out there and he said it was the most
- 22 impressive thing that he had ever saw. He was all over
- 23 it. He was there for two hours. As far as waste tires
- 24 goes --
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: You're holding a

- 1 bill. How much did the engineer cost?
- 2 MR. BALL: For him to come out and tell me
- 3 it was a good deal, \$180, but I called him three times
- 4 since. He has not returned my call, and then coffee shop
- 5 talk is that he supposedly is trying to set this up back
- 6 east somewhere.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: But he didn't
- 8 give you anything in writing other than the bill.
- 9 MR. BALL: Other than this right here, the
- 10 engineered retaining wall, I got the paid receipt and he
- 11 has not returned my calls. I've called three times.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: What is the date of
- 13 all that?
- 14 MR. BALL: This is right after they came.
- 15 Cody said that it would have to be engineered and
- 16 (inaudible) if it was going through. The date on this is
- 17 7-29-99, and that was right when the tires were there. I
- 18 got him there so he could see.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: But now Amador
- 20 County did not give you a clearance or a permit or
- 21 whatever the word is?
- 22 MR. BALL: A verbal.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: They did give you a
- 24 verbal?
- 25 MR. BALL: Yes. And as far as --

- 1 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Is there anybody
- 2 here from Amador County who --
- MR. BALL: Well, after all of this they
- 4 came out and said you've got to get this out and you're in
- 5 trouble. I called another meeting with the County and at
- 6 that meeting nobody has any knowledge of ever writing a
- 7 letter here, but then again, they say nobody complained.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Well, they say
- 9 nobody complained, but that's not the point.
- 10 MR. BALL: I understand that. I understand
- 11 that. We honestly thought that we -- still to this date I
- 12 feel I have the answer for these tires. We have a lot
- 13 of --
- 14 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I'm just thinking
- 15 out loud now, Mr. Ball. I know it's difficult for the
- 16 average citizen to win his way through the governmental
- 17 processes.
- 18 MR. BALL: Thank you.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That I understand.
- MR. BALL: Thank you.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That's why we were
- 22 easy on you the last time, but I -- but you certainly knew
- 23 that you should have gotten a permit from Amador County,
- 24 especially when you're having problems with tires at the
- 25 very time that you were collecting them.

- 1 MR. BALL: I told them that we had just
- 2 gotten wrote up for that and do we abandon this or can we
- 3 still go for it. Prior to me doing any tire chips on the
- 4 wall I called Terry Smith and I asked him about it, and he
- 5 says that he told me to keep it under 500 tires. Well,
- 6 the way that we stack 500 tires, it wouldn't be no more
- 7 than four feet long or three feet high. And it was my
- 8 understanding that I had the okay from him, and if someone
- 9 complained we would take them out and come here and
- 10 answer. That was my --
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Mr. Chairman, I have
- 12 no further questions. Maybe later I will.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you, Mr. Ball.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman, let
- 15 me ask a question.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: You said the 500
- 18 tires would be four feet by three feet?
- MR. BALL: Yes, sir.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Certainly you
- 21 knew that there was more according to these pictures.
- 22 MR. BALL: There's a lot more than 500
- 23 tires. There's 343 tons -- is that what we came up with?
- 24 And that's not counting sidewalls. That is just the tread
- 25 part. The sidewalls we went to various dairies. Now we

- 1 have a deal with --
- 2 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: So you knew there
- 3 was more than 500 tires there?
- 4 MR. BALL: Well, yeah. And I explained
- 5 that when I was talking to him and I said 500 tires won't
- 6 work. We went back and forth and back and forth, and I
- 7 honestly believed that he said okay. And I went and told
- 8 my mother at this time. I said hey, I think they're going
- 9 to let me do it. She says are you sure? And I go well,
- 10 I'm positive. I talked back and forth with him for
- 11 probably 15 minutes on that issue and it was my
- 12 understanding that it was okay.
- We certainly didn't mean to get back in
- 14 here and cause more problems and to cause the hardships
- 15 that it did. It took me a long time to clean it up
- 16 because I have an older truck. I blew one motor, then we
- 17 got it going, then I blew a transmission. Put another one
- 18 in. It turned out to be a dud. We went back and got
- 19 another one, and now we need a third transmission. We had
- 20 nothing but -- it wasn't the money problems. We're not
- 21 rich. We generated \$103,000 on the waste tires last year
- 22 and we were able to pay our debts as we went. We don't
- 23 have a big nest egg or anything like that, but the problem
- 24 of taking so long was because of mechanical problems.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Ball, let us go back

- 1 to Ms. Williams and in a few minutes you'll be able to
- 2 present your case-in-chief.
- 3 Ms. Williams and Mr. Begley.
- 4 MS. WILLIAMS: I have just a few
- 5 formalities.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: And I think Mr. Begley is
- 7 going to have a presentation.
- 8 MR. BEGLEY: I just had a couple of
- 9 comments. The regulations do not require a permit if you
- 10 have 500 tires stored on your site. I believe the intent
- 11 of that was if you're a small tire dealer and you have
- 12 less than 500 waste tires, you don't need a permit, a
- 13 storage permit. It does not authorize you to haul tires
- 14 to that site. You can't haul 499 tires to a thousand
- 15 sites all over the state. If the tires are already there,
- 16 you don't need a permit. There's nothing in the hauler
- 17 regulations that authorize hauling to a site that is not
- 18 legally permitted to receive them.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: However, if he had a
- 20 permit from Amador County to build this retaining wall --
- 21 MR. BEGLEY: He did not have a permit.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I'm talking for
- 23 purposes of information.
- 24 MR. BEGLEY: Right. I have two cases, one
- 25 in Kern County where they issued a building permit for a

- 1 gentleman to build a house out of tires. In that case the
- 2 tires were part of the feedstock or materials to build the
- 3 house and so we weren't involved in that. It so happens
- 4 that he didn't build the house and now it's come back on
- 5 us because all the tires that were stored there are still
- 6 there.
- 7 Last week I ran into a person who says he
- 8 has a permit from the County of San Bernardino to build a
- 9 house out of tires. That hasn't been verified yet, but
- 10 this is a common problem and it always gets back to the
- 11 registered hauler hauling tires to a site that is not
- 12 permitted and not legally able to accept those tires.
- 13 That is the crux of this matter today.
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Williams.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Begley, are you aware of
- 16 whether there is any documentation or did you have any
- 17 conversations with Amador County indicating that they
- 18 approved this project?
- MR. BEGLEY: I met Margaret Blood up there
- 20 and I also talked to Public Works and they have not seen
- 21 any engineered drawing that they would approve. And so
- 22 there was no -- no one issued any authorization to take
- 23 those tires there.
- MS. WILLIAMS: So as a result of these
- 25 impressions, did you issue a letter of denial for

- 1 Mr. Ball's year-to-date 2000 application?
- 2 MR. BEGLEY: Yes. I believe we sent ten
- 3 letters out. Mr. Fitzgerald mentioned that in his
- 4 introductory statement.
- 5 MS. WILLIAMS: If I can have a moment to
- 6 review my notes.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, while
- 8 she's reviewing her notes, may I ask Mr. Begley a
- 9 question?
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Please. Mr. Jones.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I -- you said when you
- 12 talked to Amador County -- I don't want to put words in.
- 13 I forgot how you said it. Did Amador County -- were they
- 14 aware of this wall, this retaining wall?
- MR. BEGLEY: Well, we had received a
- 16 complaint from Margaret Blood, the LEA, shortly after a
- 17 hearing in February that word was in town he was hauling
- 18 tires again and putting them up on the residence so we
- 19 made an inspection out there. When I talked to her, she
- 20 said she had discussed the project with him, but the LEA
- 21 obviously is not in a position to authorize the project.
- 22 And then I talked to a person at the Public Works office
- 23 and they said they hadn't received any information or
- 24 plans for the project.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Did they -- had --

- 1 okay. That second person, did they know of the project?
- 2 Forget that they got the plans. Did they --
- 3 MR. BEGLEY: Only Mr. Ball had talked to
- 4 them and mentioned that there was a proposed project.
- 5 They were aware, yeah.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: They were aware.
- 7 Okay. Because I know there's a difference in being aware
- 8 and having the letter, and I just want to make sure. They
- 9 were aware. Do they normally issue building permits for
- 10 retaining walls in Amador County?
- 11 MR. BEGLEY: This kind of a project because
- 12 right above the slope area it's kind of a hill and at the
- 13 top is a concrete water creek and it supplies water down
- 14 below. And I believe in this case you'd have to get
- 15 several approvals in order to disturb that area. I don't
- 16 know if they normally issue permits for retaining walls or
- 17 not.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'm just wondering
- 19 because I'm nervous about this fine line between a civil
- 20 engineering project and disposal.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Williams.
- 22 MS. WILLIAMS: I just have one final
- 23 question for Mr. Cambridge.
- Mr. Cambridge, you heard that Mr. Ball
- 25 stated that he was informed that he would be allowed to

- 1 maintain 500 waste tires at his site. Do you remember
- 2 when you might have informed him and under what context
- 3 you informed him of that?
- 4 MR. CAMBRIDGE: Mr. Ball is correct. There
- 5 has been a long debated question of whether or not they
- 6 can transport tires to that location or whatever. The
- 7 reality is our definition of 500 tires or more is
- 8 considered a waste tire facility. Mr. Ball was asking if
- 9 he could haul tires overnight by his truck, process the
- 10 tires, put them back on the truck and then remove them the
- 11 following day. I said as long as you do not go over 500
- 12 tires. I did state that.
- 13 MS. WILLIAMS: Do you remember when that
- 14 was?
- MR. CAMBRIDGE: That was at the
- 16 beginning of -- or not the beginning, but towards the end
- 17 of the first problem we had with this site, probably 1997,
- 18 1998, whatever it was.
- 19 MS. WILLIAMS: That was the West Clinton
- 20 Road site that resulted in Cleanup and Abatement Order and
- 21 administrative penalties in 1996 and the decision in 1997?
- MR. CAMBRIDGE: This is correct.
- 23 MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. Nothing further at
- 24 this time, Mr. Chairman.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of any of

- 1 the witnesses before we go to Mr. Ball? I have a couple
- 2 and perhaps, Counsel, you can also participate.
- 3 My understanding is that if we frame the
- 4 issue, since Mr. Ball has been here the last time from the
- 5 resolution that was adopted, he has -- where he remediated
- 6 the two illegal waste tire facilities, that was done prior
- 7 to our vote on the resolution, if I'm not mistaken, if
- 8 history serves me correctly.
- 9 MR. CAMBRIDGE: That's correct.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: So what's before us is a
- 11 whole new and different pile.
- MR. CAMBRIDGE: Correct.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. Has he completed
- 14 the payment by January 1st, 2000? Are we aware of that?
- 15 That was also a condition as I'm reading through the
- 16 resolution here.
- MS. WILLIAMS: If I may be sworn to
- 18 testify, I can. Yes, I am aware that --
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: They do have disciplinary
- 20 proceedings, so I would assume you'll be, you know --
- 21 MS. WILLIAMS: I am aware and have seen a
- 22 copy of the notice from accounting that a check was
- 23 received that satisfied the amount that the Board
- 24 requested as part of the resolution for the 1999 denial
- 25 hearing.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. So we are not at
- 2 least -- for purposes of trying to make a determination,
- 3 any of those conditions of that resolution are not -- have
- 4 all been met.
- 5 MS. WILLIAMS: They were late, but he did
- 6 finally comply.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Now, moving to the pile,
- 8 because it's my understanding under the statute what we're
- 9 here for is that the reason for the non-renewal is that we
- 10 have it within our authority if there's a recurring
- 11 pattern or there's a threat to public health and safety.
- 12 When the LEA contacted -- whom did the LEA
- 13 contact about the complaint?
- 14 MR. BEGLEY: I received a call personally.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: And did she in her
- 16 estimation believe that there was a threat to public
- 17 health and safety?
- 18 MR. BEGLEY: Yes. She was very concerned
- 19 because of the previous piles that Mr. Ball had been
- 20 involved in and because of the fire threat. It's up in
- 21 the wooded area and it's right in back of the residence.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: So the violations that
- 23 were -- we have issued some violations as it relates to
- 24 this new pile subsequent to the last time Mr. Ball was
- 25 here?

- 1 MR. CAMBRIDGE: Correct.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. So those would be
- 3 additional kinds of violations from the original
- 4 violation. I'm trying to establish, you know, some --
- 5 MR. CAMBRIDGE: These would be additional
- 6 violations of the same sort, yeah.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: And that's where you're
- 8 trying to say the statute does then permit under those
- 9 circumstances of the non-renewal, either because there's
- 10 been a recurring pattern of --
- MS. WILLIAMS: We are --
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: -- violations or multiple
- 13 violations?
- MS. WILLIAMS: We are alleging that yes,
- 15 the violations since the February Board hearing are
- 16 sufficient under 42951(b) for a denial of this
- 17 registration for the year 2000.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay.
- 19 MS. WILLIAMS: I only bring up the history
- 20 to indicate that the Board may consider past violations or
- 21 the respondent's past history with the Board in
- 22 contemplating their action as a result.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: And I understand that, and
- 24 I think in other words that goes to the point that you
- 25 made about a continuing pattern, but I just wanted to see

- 1 if the pile that was spoken about that formed the basis,
- 2 whether it be for a civil engineering or another work, was
- 3 a whole new separate pile from the last time we were here.
- 4 Thank you. That clarifies some of the
- 5 issues.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I have one question of
- 9 staff, and I know it's your case to put on, but it's a
- 10 piece of information that I'd like to see since it's all
- 11 under the same division.
- 12 We came up with a policy of what was
- 13 required to -- for civil engineering project. We had a
- 14 criteria and we had a policy. Do you guys have a copy of
- 15 that?
- MR. CAMBRIDGE: I do not, no.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. It would be
- 18 nice to see.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: If there's nothing
- 20 further, Mr. Ball, you may proceed with your presentation.
- 21 MR. BALL: I don't know really what to
- 22 say. We started gathering tires in the middle '80s. We
- 23 used the West Clinton facility. The County said that we
- 24 had better stop doing that, so we applied for an
- 25 application for a minor facility at the existing site of

- 1 Fine's wrecking yard where I at no time exceeded my 5,000
- 2 tires. There were thousands and thousands of tires on the
- 3 place. I paid for every single cent. I did every bit of
- 4 work without not one bit of help from those people. I
- 5 even caught them bringing in illegal tires after it was
- 6 ordered to be cleaned up, and at that time my fine went
- 7 from \$1,000 to \$9,000 and the Board was good enough to
- 8 reduce that fine down to me.
- We've tried. We're not the bad people.
- 10 We've really tried hard. On this wall, Margaret Blood,
- 11 she flat denied that she ever called in a complaint, but
- 12 that's neither here nor there. On this wall, everybody
- 13 that's looked at it has said that we're onto something.
- 14 We've stacked the tires up against the canal, and the
- 15 purpose after that was to rick-rack rock up along the
- 16 front. You wouldn't have even seen a tire, and at the
- 17 top, about four feet of fill dirt. What we would have
- 18 lost on the bottom, we would have gained on the top.
- The water canal has boils, roots and stuff
- 20 and it blows out all the time. The water agency does not
- 21 do anything about it until it blows all the way, then they
- 22 have a big sheet of rubber that they drop into the canal
- 23 and it takes the water on past the blow-out point.
- 24 They, like the County, are interested in
- 25 doing the wall, but they're not going to write no letter

- 1 until we resolve it here. This would be the first place
- 2 because like Cody said, it doesn't matter what they say.
- 3 If it gets denied here, it isn't gonna never go nowhere.
- 4 We honestly felt that what we were doing
- 5 was right. We never intended to get into any trouble or
- 6 do anything wrong. We've always had fire extinguishers.
- 7 There is a gate on the front when you first come in. We
- 8 don't lock it. You might have a picture of my little
- 9 puppy dog. He tends to keep the riffraff out pretty good.
- 10 He's timber wolf, husky and shepard and has all his teeth,
- 11 and there's always someone on the site.
- 12 We have shovels. We do have a pike's pole.
- 13 We have gravity flow water, plus we have the pump water
- 14 from the house. We have a 2,500-gallon water tank in case
- 15 of a fire emergency. The reason that I did not clear the
- 16 brush at the top of my pile is because I didn't want it to
- 17 die off and have more roots rotting out and another
- 18 problem until we had it built up, and then all tie it in
- 19 at once then clear the brush. The way that the canal is
- 20 set up, even if it did catch on fire it would burn to the
- 21 water and it really wouldn't go anywhere. The property
- 22 above it is land-locked and you can't build nothing on it.
- 23 The water canal which feeds Jackson is 14 miles long,
- 24 land-locks that piece of property. You can never build
- 25 nothing on it. It has manzanita and brush and that is

- 1 right above our house.
- We have been fighting that water canal.
- 3 When we first got in the house, I believe it was in '85,
- 4 we have put automobiles up against it. We've put logs up
- 5 against it. I had 2,000 bails of straw up against it one
- 6 year. That was a real mess to get rid of. We have tried
- 7 everything, and since we put that tire up last year, we
- 8 did not have one problem, not one blow-out. We didn't
- 9 have to have the water agency come out. And right now
- 10 everybody is just kind of sitting to see if this will fly
- 11 or not.
- 12 We do have a tire store in Plymouth. We've
- 13 had that for a year and a half. We collect our tires. We
- 14 put the good ones over there and then we wholesale out.
- 15 We're not open to the public. There's just no business
- 16 over there it's so slow, and if we could get our hauler
- 17 registration back, we would love the chance to get out and
- 18 really do some work and we would use the tire shop as a
- 19 facility to process the tires. We're such a small
- 20 business up there in the area. We don't have the big
- 21 turnover like the people down here in the city.
- I have -- since my big truck broke, we've
- 23 got it repaired and we've also bought a U-Haul-type truck,
- 24 which is a really good little truck. So now we can,
- 25 between my several trucks and my trailers, we can move

- 1 about a thousand tires at a time.
- 2 Last year we processed 30 -- I believe it
- 3 was 34,000 tires, and on top of that there was almost
- 4 2,000 truck tires and approximately 200 OTR tires weighing
- 5 anywhere from a thousand to 2,000 pounds a piece. And
- 6 we've gotten rid of everything and kept our manifests as
- 7 best we've known how. I noticed there was an article that
- 8 we weren't keeping them right, and I -- if we're doing
- 9 something wrong, we definitely want to know what we're
- 10 doing.
- 11 We have multiple pick-ups, sometimes we
- 12 have five or six loads, five or six customers on one
- 13 manifest, and we keep a little invoice which has the
- 14 manifest number so we are able to trace back any manifest
- 15 to the invoice to tell you where it went. We don't know
- 16 what --
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
- 18 MR. BALL: We feel our project is good.
- 19 We'd like to get permission to look into it more.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Ball, you've
- 22 had some difficulty with this agency in the past; correct?
- MR. BALL: Yeah, but I think you guys are
- 24 pretty sharp cookies.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Well, thank you.

- 1 MR. BALL: Okay.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: And you, Mr. Ball, are
- 3 as sharp as they come.
- 4 MR. BALL: I am trying.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Since you've had
- 6 difficulties with us before, when you started building
- 7 this thing, you knew that you had exceeded 500 tires.
- 8 MR. BALL: I thought --
- 9 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Why didn't you
- 10 come to us and ask us --
- MR. BALL: I honestly thought that I'm just
- 12 trying to save an argument down the road with Terry Smith.
- 13 I honestly thought I had permission. He told me when I
- 14 called him up here a month or two that he said under 500.
- 15 I honestly thought I had permission to go for it. I'm
- 16 just trying not to throw mud in anybody's face because I
- 17 want to be part of this deal.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: It just seems to
- 19 me that you've dealt with us before and we ask you do you
- 20 have a piece of paper and we ask you these things.
- 21 Certainly one of our staff, it would seem that you would
- 22 at least know to say can you put that in writing or can
- 23 you give me something that --
- MR. BALL: I'm learning that, sir. I'm
- 25 definitely learning that. It's like dealing with the

- 1 County of Amador. They flat denied in a board room just
- 2 like -- in a meeting they flat denied that they ever made
- 3 any complaints at all. And as far as building the wall,
- 4 they said well, you see what the Board says. If they give
- 5 you permission to look into it, we'll back you up. And --
- 6 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: It seems like --
- 7 MR. BALL: -- the same with the water
- 8 agency. As far as the vector code, I don't believe that
- 9 exists up in that area. I've talked to all the tire
- 10 stores that I deal with and they don't know what you're
- 11 talking about with the vector number.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: State law applies
- 13 up there, too.
- 14 MR. BALL: I'm sure it does.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: They still are a
- 16 part of this thing.
- 17 MR. BALL: Yes. Thank you. I think I
- 18 should have been a lawyer.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Perhaps you should
- 20 have.
- 21 MR. BALL: I think so.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: It may have hurt the case.
- 23 Any other questions of Mr. Ball?
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Eaton.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones. I'm sorry.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The width of this wall
- 2 right now from the existing slope, and I guess it doesn't
- 3 exist anymore, but whatever this width was -- how wide?
- 4 MR. BALL: I would have like to have went
- 5 out about 20 feet, sir.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: How wide did it go
- 7 out?
- 8 MR. BALL: 15, maybe 20 feet. 15 to 20
- 9 feet somewhere at the widest point. Up closer to the
- 10 house it got wider. Towards the back it got narrower.
- 11 The idea was to line it with rock and leave an access road
- 12 for the water agency to get in at the top because there is
- 13 no place for the water agency to get to that particular
- 14 quadrant of the ditch. You can see the one picture there
- 15 where the trees are that the canal is only eight feet
- 16 wide. You can't drive a vehicle over it, and that was
- 17 part of my discussion with them that hey, I'll get it
- 18 sheared up, I'll get it rock faced, and you guys can have
- 19 your road going along the bottom of it. And they really
- 20 liked that idea for giving them access, and it could also
- 21 be used for fire or whatever, but if there was a fire in
- 22 that area I think they would just probably let it burn out
- 23 because there's really nothing above the house. You
- 24 understand what I'm saying?
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right.

- 1 MR. BALL: Try to put out manzanita.
 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I know.
- 3 MR. BALL: You know, it's --
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The pictures I'm
- 5 seeing, did you have a standard strip length that you cut
- 6 these to?
- 7 MR. BALL: Uh-huh.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: For a reason?
- 9 MR. BALL: Uh-huh.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: What was the reason?
- 11 MR. BALL: For stacking easy. The longer
- 12 ones don't stack. The shorter ones, they tend to fall
- 13 over. We ran into a little bit of trouble. When we first
- 14 started, the wall was falling over on us. We crisscrossed
- 15 the bottom stack and actually made it hold, but the truth
- 16 is you need to have the leaching in first and then you
- 17 need to start your wall, your rock, and then it all needs
- 18 to go up at the same time. We went up this way, then we
- 19 were going to put the leach line in it. We went off
- 20 half-cocked after talking to the engineers and a few other
- 21 contractors that really are interested in this. It's
- 22 pretty much -- there is a simple layout, like I said, that
- 23 could be used in the delta levies very easy.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: How was it going to be
- 25 secured?

- MR. BALL: Its own weight is holding it in.
- 2 In a situation like that, there is no hard rock in that
- 3 levy. It's just dirt.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just limestone.
- 5 MR. BALL: You can't put nothing into it.
- 6 Otherwise you're going to create a weakness right there.
- 7 That's why we have such a bad problem with the roots.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: So when the tires were
- 9 going to come out, it was going to be -- the tires were
- 10 going to be covered by --
- 11 MR. BALL: Dirt on the top and rock on the
- 12 facing that you would see. You would never actually see a
- 13 tire, and the idea behind that would be it would blow out,
- 14 the water would trickle through the tires, drop down. We
- 15 took it into an area where it needs to go. And the
- 16 neighbor below me is in twice as bad a shape as I am and
- 17 he's the quy that originally called every single day the
- 18 first time I had a cleanup complaining about it. Now
- 19 we're buddies and he wants that wall down on his property.
- 20 But everybody is just waiting to see what happens here as
- 21 far as that goes.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. I have a
- 23 question of staff.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: But you're not here today,
- 25 you understand that, to seek approval of that wall.

- 1 MR. BALL: No. I'm here to get my license
- 2 back and then to see if we can look into doing this wall.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: That's a separate
- 4 proceeding. That's not going to be part of why you're
- 5 here.
- 6 MR. BALL: I understand that.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Based on the
- 8 Chairman's question, he's in violation for hauling to an
- 9 unlicensed waste tire disposal site.
- 10 MR. CAMBRIDGE: Correct.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: If this facility --
- 12 okay. The way -- this is the way that you guys came and
- 13 saw it.
- 14 MR. CAMBRIDGE: That's correct.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The tires had been
- 16 cleaned, there weren't any stockpiles of tires or
- 17 stockpiles of these.
- 18 MR. CAMBRIDGE: There were a few scattered
- 19 whole tires around.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Less than 500.
- 21 MR. CAMBRIDGE: I believe so.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And so really -- I
- 23 need to really -- I'm having a hard time with this. Does
- 24 everybody in the state that's going to do a civil
- 25 engineering project with tires have to get approval from

- 1 the State, from the Waste Board, or what's the criteria?
- 2 You know -- because this can be -- I want to make sure if
- 3 this is an illegal landfill, if this is an illegal dump or
- 4 a waste pile, then that's -- obviously, that's the way it
- 5 needs to be treated.
- 6 If it is a civil engineering project,
- 7 what's the criteria that makes this a civil engineering
- 8 project and who has to approve it? Because then it's not
- 9 an illegal dump or an illegal waste tire site, it's a
- 10 positive reuse that actually goes toward reuse of scrap
- 11 tires.
- 12 MR. BALL: And that's our -- been our goal
- 13 the whole time, to find a secret for these things.
- 14 MR. BEGLEY: What we've been using when
- 15 someone asks us about a project with tires, we tell them
- 16 to contact the local agency with their proposal. If the
- 17 local agency approves it, I mentioned Kern County had
- 18 issued a building permit for a man to build a house and so
- 19 we were basically out of it. So it happens in that case
- 20 the house wasn't built and now the tires are not only on
- 21 his property but two of his neighbors' and we're going
- 22 for -- to take enforcement action and we'll probably end
- 23 up cleaning them up.
- 24 In this case, if Amador County had issued a
- 25 permit to him to build this retaining wall or flood

- 1 control or whatever it might be, then we wouldn't be
- 2 involved. There's really no provision in the statute or
- 3 regs for engineering projects.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: We have a policy.
- 5 MR. BEGLEY: And that's what we've been
- 6 doing is if the local agency approves it, we don't need to
- 7 approve it. We don't need a permit if the local agency
- 8 has said yes, this is a legitimate project.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: So if the local agency
- 10 said yes, this is a legitimate project, would there --
- 11 would Mr. Ball be in front of us today?
- MR. BEGLEY: No.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay.
- 14 MR. CAMBRIDGE: I might further add we had
- 15 one site in Fresno that they were building a tire garden,
- 16 and prior to building this garden they did obtain a minor
- 17 waste facility permit. They still maintain that permit
- 18 until the garden is finished and then we'll bring it in
- 19 front of the Board.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I don't have a problem
- 21 with what you guys did. You need to understand that. I
- 22 just want to make sure that we're consistent with the
- 23 policies that we're putting out of this place.
- MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Hold on. Mr. Ball, have

- 1 you completed your --
- MR. BALL: Yes.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay.
- 4 MS. WILLIAMS: I'm sorry. Is Mr. Ball --
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: He has completed his
- 6 presentation.
- 7 MS. WILLIAMS: May I ask him a few
- 8 questions?
- 9 MR. BALL: Surely you may.
- 10 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Ball, when did you first
- 11 seek county approval for the existing or the most recent
- 12 site of the West Clinton Road?
- 13 MR. BALL: When did I first ask for it?
- 14 MS. WILLIAMS: When did you first seek
- 15 permission from the County or did you?
- MR. BALL: I believe it would be about '85,
- 17 '86.
- 18 MS. WILLIAMS: In 1985?
- MR. BALL: Yes, ma'am.
- 20 MS. WILLIAMS: For this project?
- 21 MR. BALL: For a project similar. I was
- 22 going to use whole tires.
- 23 MS. WILLIAMS: And did you discuss this
- 24 with any -- this particular project with any Board staff?
- 25 MR. BALL: No. At that time I don't

1 believe the Board was around; were they?

MS. WILLIAMS: At any time --2 3 MR. BALL: You're talking about the project right now. 5 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. The project we're discussing. 7 MR. BALL: I discussed it with Terry Smith. 8 MS. WILLIAMS: I have no further questions. I would like to call, however, Terry Smith. 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Bring Mr. Smith up and 11 swear him in as a witness, please. 12 13 TERRY SMITH, called as a witness by the California Integrated Waste 15 Management Board, having been duly sworn, was examined and 16 testified as follows: 17 18 EXAMINATION 19 BY MS. WILLIAMS: 20 Mr. Smith, what is your occupation? 21 A. I work in the Permits Section of the Waste Tire Management Branch. 23 And what are your duties? Q. 24 I basically process permits and give people A. information on how they can come into compliance with

- 1 Title 14 and federal regulations regarding tire storage.
- 2 Q. Specifically regarding tire storage, do you
- 3 recall having any permission -- any discussions with
- 4 Mr. Ball regarding permission to store waste tires on
- 5 sites?
- 6 A. I had several discussions with Mr. Ball.
- 7 Q. Do you have any recollection of any
- 8 regarding his questions of you regarding permitting of
- 9 sites?
- 10 A. Yes. He first called me back in '98. We
- 11 met at the tire workshop when we were doing emergency
- 12 regulations and he was asking questions about permits and
- 13 requirements for tire storage.
- 14 Q. Did you have a conversation with him in
- 15 October of 1998?
- 16 A. Yes, I did.
- 17 Q. And what was the nature of that discussion?
- 18 A. Well, it was pretty shotgun. He asked
- 19 about a lot of things and he has a lot of ideas and some
- 20 of them may be good ideas, but one of them was repairing
- 21 the levy, the water ditch, with tires. He even mentioned
- 22 floating tires down the ditch and repairing that levy on
- 23 downstream from his place. I told him that anything that
- 24 he would have had in mind, if he was going to store up to
- 25 500 tires he needed to get a permit, and if he was going

- 1 to construct a wall or a levy or French drain, as he calls
- 2 it, then he needed to get the project approved at the
- 3 local level first and then come to us for approval.
- 4 Q. Okay.
- 5 MS. WILLIAMS: I have no further questions.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of
- 7 Mr. Smith?
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Go ahead.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The -- Terry, in the
- 10 past throughout the state of California people have been
- 11 trying to make walls and stuff. Is it normally out of
- 12 whole tires or is it this type of formation or is it a
- 13 mixture?
- 14 MR. SMITH: It's a mixture. I don't have
- 15 any statistics on it but they do both.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Because I know we've
- 17 had to clean up some projects where they used it to
- 18 shore-up these types of aqueducts, rivers, that type of
- 19 stuff. Most of those it seems that we've done lately
- 20 since I've been on this Board have been whole tires that
- 21 were buried for that purpose.
- MR. SMITH: Yeah.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: When you had
- 25 these discussions with him about the tire wall, the French

- 1 drain, whatever, did he ask you to put anything in
- 2 writing? Did he ask you your permission to construct this
- 3 thing? What was the nature of his questions?
- 4 MR. SMITH: He was just telling me all of
- 5 the projects he had in mind and we were just discussing
- 6 it. He didn't ask for anything in writing.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Did he ask you,
- 8 though, whether he could do this or not?
- 9 MR. SMITH: Yes. He told me what he had in
- 10 mind and I told him what he needed to do. As a matter of
- 11 fact, I did send him an application package.
- 12 MS. WILLIAMS: For a minor waste tire
- 13 facility permit?
- MR. SMITH: Yes, for a minor.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Okay. Thank you.
- 16 For this project or was it project-specific?
- 17 MR. SMITH: He asked me for -- about a lot
- 18 of different projects and I sent him one application. I
- 19 don't know what he was going to use it for. There's a
- 20 place called Poor Mike's Tires and then he's talking about
- 21 purchasing an automobile dismantler.
- 22 MR. BALL: That's what it was for. Yes.
- 23 I'm sorry.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Okay.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Do you want to have any

- 1 closing statements?
- 2 MS. WILLIAMS: I would, however, request
- 3 that since it is the State's burden, we have the final
- 4 opportunity for closing as a practice.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: There's rebuttal that you
- 6 can make if you wish at this time.
- 7 MS. WILLIAMS: I actually --
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: And Mr. Ball has the
- 9 opportunity for rebuttal and then you, Mr. Ball, would
- 10 close and then you would close thereafter and then we
- 11 would have any final questions from the Board and have our
- 12 deliberations.
- 13 MS. WILLIAMS: If I may have a moment to
- 14 confer with the staff member who just entered the
- 15 chambers.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Fine. While we're doing
- 17 that we will take a short ten-minute break because I
- 18 notice that the court reporter is ready for a break as
- 19 well.
- 20 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. We'll return
- 22 in ten minutes.
- 23 (Brief recess taken)
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Ladies and
- 25 gentlemen, we're back in session.

1 Members, any ex partes to report? 2 Mr. Pennington. 3 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: No, Mr. Chairman. 4 Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones. 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: No. 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson. 8 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Just said 9 hello to Terry Lavelle. 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Senator Roberti. 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: No ex partes. 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: And none for me. I'm 13 up-to-date. Ms. Williams. 14 15 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As 16 part of our rebuttal we would like to call and swear in 17 Martha Gildart and Byron Fitzgerald. 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Emery, would you mind 19 swearing in these two individuals. 20 21 MARTHA GILDART and BYRON FITZGERALD, 22 called as witnesses by the California Integrated Waste

23 Management Board, having been duly sworn, were examined

25

24 and testified as follows:

- 1 EXAMINATION
- 2 BY MS. WILLIAMS:
- 3 Q. Ms. Gildart, by whom are you currently
- 4 employed?
- 5 A. State of California Integrated Waste
- 6 Management Board.
- 7 Q. What are your current duties?
- 8 A. I manage the Waste Tire Management Branch
- 9 which governs both the permitting and enforcement and
- 10 remediation functions and the grant and market development
- 11 functions.
- 12 Q. And just prior to your current role, what
- 13 were your responsibilities?
- 14 A. I was the manager of the Technology
- 15 Evaluation Branch and Markets Development Division which
- 16 looked at uses for waste tires.
- 17 Q. In the combination of those roles, are you
- 18 aware of past practices regarding the approval of waste
- 19 tire facilities as engineered projects?
- 20 A. I can recall two specific projects. One
- 21 was with Humboldt County. It entailed the use of bailed
- 22 tires in a gabion structure and dirt backfill for a road
- 23 embankment, and that was an engineered, designed and
- 24 approved and stamped project.
- 25 Q. If I may ask, approved by a civil engineer?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. And did you review that application
- 3 yourself?
- 4 A. My engineering staff reviewed the
- 5 application. I have seen and discussed the project, but I
- 6 did not go through that in detail.
- 7 Q. Okay. I'm sorry. And the other?
- 8 A. The other project was one that came to the
- 9 Board not through the grant program but was seeking
- 10 permission for the use of the tires, and that was the use,
- 11 once again, of bailed whole tires as a backstop for a
- 12 firing range that the City of Tracy Police Department had
- 13 constructed, and the decision was that if the City was
- 14 willing to say it met their standards and was willing to
- 15 back up their approval with the commitment to clean up
- 16 those tires and remove them if at any point it became an
- 17 environmental threat to health or safety, then the Board
- 18 would give that approval.
- 19 They had also offered that same permission
- 20 to half a dozen other cities who expressed interest in a
- 21 similar use, but none of those cities wished to take up
- 22 that approval. So we only had the one project go forward.
- Q. So is it fair to characterize your approval
- 24 of those projects as being based on either a sign-off by a
- 25 civil engineer or acceptance by the local agency for the

- 1 ultimate liability or responsibility proposed by that
- 2 project?
- 3 A. Correct.
- Q. Are you aware if there is a written policy
- 5 regarding the approval of engineered projects?
- 6 A. I'm not aware of a written policy.
- 7 Q. Okay.
- 8 MS. WILLIAMS: I have no further questions
- 9 for Ms. Gildart at this time.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of
- 11 Ms. Gildart?
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The Humboldt County
- 15 one was one that we funded; right?
- MS. GILDART: Correct.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: So was the condition
- 18 of the -- engineering was one of the conditions of the
- 19 grant?
- 20 MS. GILDART: Correct. To receive a grant,
- 21 you have -- the applicant must show he has all applicable
- 22 permissions, code standards, approvals, in advance of our
- 23 funding.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The -- and I really
- 25 did think we had a written policy. Weren't we working on

- 1 something in market development in civil engineering where
- 2 we had conditions of what a civil engineering project
- 3 would be?
- 4 MS. GILDART: My recollection is those were
- 5 specific projects that came before us, that it wasn't a
- 6 policy set forth that the Board voted on to set a policy.
- 7 I think it was more precedent setting through specific
- 8 projects.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any other questions?
- 11 Thank you. Next witness.
- 12 MS. WILLIAMS: If I may briefly ask
- 13 Mr. Fitzgerald.

14

- 15 EXAMINATION
- 16 BY MS. WILLIAMS:
- 17 Q. How are you currently employed and what is
- 18 your title?
- 19 A. I'm the acting Deputy Director of the
- 20 Special Waste Division which is responsible for oversight
- 21 of the tire program, oil program, and household hazardous
- 22 waste.
- Q. Are you aware of any existing procedure or
- 24 policy within the Special Waste program regarding proposed
- 25 engineering projects using waste tires as a feedstock or

- 1 resource?
- 2 A. I would have to echo what Ms. Gildart just
- 3 said. I'm aware of the past practice we've had that the
- 4 projects have been approved by the Board, have been
- 5 engineered as such, or if they have to be approved by the
- 6 local government agency responsible for them. So for all
- 7 of the tire projects that require civil engineering
- 8 approach to a problem, they've all had to meet those
- 9 standards by past practice.
- 10 Q. Have you had an opportunity to review the
- 11 Ball project?
- 12 A. Not in any detail. I'm generally familiar
- 13 with it but not any specific details.
- 14 MS. WILLIAMS: If I may ask then one final
- 15 question for Mr. Begley.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Begley.
- 17 MS. WILLIAMS: Regarding Mr. Fitzgerald's
- 18 testimony about your program's policy, in your estimation
- 19 does the situation created by Mr. Ball that brings us to
- 20 this hearing today, in combination, does it meet the
- 21 criteria as described by Mr. Fitzgerald regarding an
- 22 engineered project?
- MR. BEGLEY: No.
- 24 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you. No further
- 25 questions.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Ball, you have ten
- 2 minutes for rebuttal.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: I'm sorry.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Could I question
- 6 the two witnesses?
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Surely.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: If someone came
- 9 to you, either of you, with an idea for a civil
- 10 engineering project, what would you do? You would have
- 11 some criteria that you would give them, some policy of
- 12 this Board.
- MS. GILDART: When you say came to us, do
- 14 you mean as a grant applicant or a permit applicant?
- 15 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Probably either.
- 16 Assuming that they don't know a lot about our department,
- 17 our Board and our rules and regulations, when somebody
- 18 came in the door and said to you I've got this idea, what
- 19 do I have to do to do this, is there some written document
- 20 that you would give them?
- 21 MS. GILDART: When the term "civil
- 22 engineering project" is used, that's going to imply that
- 23 there is an engineering function, that the project
- 24 provides some kind of support, stability, erosion control,
- 25 load bearing, that there is such a function behind the

- 1 project. If that is so, there are codes and standards,
- 2 building codes, safety codes, and engineers, licensed
- 3 engineers who will review and stamp those drawings with
- 4 their approval if it meets those standards. If it is that
- 5 kinds of project and they were a grant applicant or permit
- 6 applicant, I would want to see that approval.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Right.
- 8 MS. GILDART: There are other projects,
- 9 though --
- 10 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I quess my point
- 11 is if they don't know whether they're a grant applicant or
- 12 a permit applicant, they just have an idea and they come
- 13 to this Board with an idea, I want to do something --
- 14 MR. FITZGERALD: In that case I think we
- 15 would refer them to the local government for the local
- 16 building codes because it would be essential to get those
- 17 approvals. Otherwise, they're bringing the tires on a
- 18 site without any particular project identified and
- 19 approved.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: And, therefore,
- 21 would they then leave with the assumption that they didn't
- 22 have to deal with this Board?
- 23 MR. FITZGERALD: Depending on how many
- 24 tires they bring on the site. If they -- we went through
- 25 this when we did the levy construction project where we

- 1 brought tires on the site at the levy. In order to keep
- 2 the tires below the level that was required in the permit,
- 3 they had to stage the tires over a period of time. This
- 4 might be a policy we're going to look at in the future,
- 5 but that's what our policy has been in the past and that's
- 6 where we are now.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The -- when you say
- 10 refer them to the local governments to see if they get
- 11 approval or not, it was pretty common practice for the
- 12 last 30 years or 40 years to use tires as erosion control.
- 13 You're cleaning up some of those messes now, and I'm sure
- 14 people are going to ask you, other agencies are going to
- 15 say don't take all the tires because if you take all the
- 16 tires, you're going to create another disaster. I mean,
- 17 that was a use, and I'm not -- what I'm trying to do, I
- 18 think this -- where I'm having a problem with this is, and
- 19 I'm going to address this to Mr. Begley, when you looked
- 20 at the pictures and the question was asked by somebody on
- 21 this Board, or maybe it was by Counsel, did this fill the
- 22 requirement of a project and you said "no", what did you
- 23 base that on? Why wouldn't this be an engineered project?
- MR. BEGLEY: We didn't say it couldn't be
- 25 an engineered project. What we suggested is that he get

- 1 an engineer to engineer the project and clear it with the
- 2 local agencies and then we could talk to him about whether
- 3 or not he needed a permit and that sort of thing.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I mean a minute or so
- 5 ago one of Ms. Williams's last questions to you was when
- 6 you saw this, did it fit the criteria. And I'm assuming
- 7 that means criteria for an engineering project or the
- 8 criteria for an illegal tire dump. I assume it meant
- 9 engineered project.
- 10 MR. BEGLEY: It didn't -- since we couldn't
- 11 permit it and we didn't have an engineered drawing or
- 12 approvals, we assumed it's just an illegal tire pile. The
- 13 potential is there for an engineered project, but we have
- 14 nothing to look at other than the pile of tires and his
- 15 suggestion to build a retaining wall out of those tires.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. Absent the
- 17 permits and all that stuff, when you viewed it, would it
- 18 in your view meet the criteria of something that could be
- 19 considered an engineered project?
- MR. BEGLEY: Oh, yeah. Sure.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's a different
- 22 answer, though. Okay. Thanks.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any other questions?
- 24 Mr. Ball.
- MR. BALL: In short, we thought we were

- 1 legal to bring in, keep under 500 tires. We believe in
- 2 the wall that we're building. We believed that we had
- 3 enough bases covered to where we could have gone with it,
- 4 and we did not try to hide tires or illegally throw them
- 5 over a bank or anything like that. We had them out in
- 6 plain sight. We put a lot of work into it and we believed
- 7 it was good, and we respectfully ask to get our license
- 8 renewed and to look into doing that tire wall project at
- 9 another time after covering all the bases, which I'm not
- 10 all that clear on.
- 11 It seems to me you have to get county
- 12 permission. The County tells me I have to get state
- 13 permission. We're still not very clear if we're going to
- 14 be able to do anything with that. I was never given
- 15 anything negative by all the carpenters, all the
- 16 contractors that looked at it. We're pretty sure we're on
- 17 to something here.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Senator Roberti.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Mr. Ball, I,
- 20 speaking only for myself, do not like to have to vote to
- 21 deny you a hauling permit. However, the issue is not
- 22 whether you had anything negative said about what you
- 23 wanted to do. The issue is whether you had something
- 24 affirmative to give you a go-ahead to produce what appears
- 25 to be a relatively important engineering project and you

- 1 just -- you had to know that you would need some kind of
- 2 permit. The fact that you went to Amador County and asked
- 3 them orally indicates you knew there was something.
- 4 MR. BALL: I figured if we covered our
- 5 bases it would probably work out, but obviously I'm not
- 6 right.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Well, I guess I've
- 8 got to work on the premise that you should have known
- 9 there should have been something much more official than
- 10 what you presume to be a go-ahead, whatever that may have
- 11 been, over the telephone.
- 12 MR. BALL: In the mid-'80s when we started
- 13 doing that there, we just stacked up old truck tires and
- 14 nobody even give it a second look at it until when Keith
- 15 and Cody came up and made us remove that one part. We had
- 16 tires that were stacked up and then in the back part we
- 17 had --
- 18 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That's true but in
- 19 the mid-'80s we didn't have all these rules --
- MR. BALL: That's for sure.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: We didn't have all
- 22 these rules on removing waste tires. So times have
- 23 changed and you know that better than anyone.
- 24 MR. BALL: Yeah. You know, being up in the
- 25 foothills, being the littlest guy, we get kicked the

- 1 hardest. This no doubt -- we get the blunt end. All the
- 2 good jobs, TRC and these other companies come up, I don't
- 3 even get a chance to bid on them, boom, they're gone.
- I get all the little \$50, \$75 jobs, the
- 5 jobs that no one doesn't want. I've done about 20 jobs
- 6 for Amador, El Dorado and Calaveras County over the last
- 7 year, and the only reason I got them is because no one
- 8 else wanted them.
- 9 But as far as the wall going, we thought we
- 10 were okay. We really did. We would have never, never
- 11 done that if we would have known we would have ended up
- 12 right back here. I was prepared and am prepared to answer
- 13 any questions about the wall. We kept proper
- 14 documentation going in, we kept it going out. We really
- 15 didn't feel that we were doing anything wrong. We
- 16 actually feel that we have the answer to this. We think
- 17 this is a good deal.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Well, I'm going to
- 19 vote to deny the license with this proviso, just to let
- 20 you know where my mind is. The other Board Members may
- 21 feel diametrically opposed on the other side. I
- 22 personally would be willing to revisit it if Amador County
- 23 gave you a permit and/or said they gave you a green
- 24 light --
- 25 MR. BALL: They just basically --

- 1 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: -- without any
- 2 promises for how I feel, then I would be happy to look at
- 3 it again, but --
- 4 MR. BALL: I definitely would --
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Absent that, just
- 6 allowing people on good intentions and tell the Board I've
- 7 got a major engineering project, it's great, and we would
- 8 have no waste tire law. Everybody would have a major
- 9 engineering project without a permit.
- 10 MR. BALL: Right. I think our canal is
- 11 probably one of a thousand others. There's not that many
- 12 situations like we have.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That could very well
- 14 be true, but I want some official imprimatur on this and
- 15 the County is the one that does --
- MR. BALL: It's been drilled into my head
- 17 that anything in the future done we will definitely have
- 18 paperwork to cover everybody and make everybody happy.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I, too, think that the
- 22 waste tire permit has to be denied, but -- and I, too,
- 23 think that tire piles being called engineering projects
- 24 don't work. I happen to think though that this is -- this
- 25 fills the need and makes sense and what I would in the

- 1 time that you don't have a waste tire permit, I would come
- 2 to this Board and get a -- try to get a grant to engineer
- 3 it and build it. I want to put him on some kind of
- 4 suspension, but I would come in on an engineered project.
- 5 MR. BALL: That wall pays for itself as
- 6 it's being built. It does not need grant money. It will
- 7 pay for itself as it goes up. There's enough money
- 8 generated from it where you don't have to stick out of
- 9 your pocket.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right. We had the
- 11 discussion the last time. We cut you pretty good slack.
- 12 This time I think we need to take -- suspend that hauler
- 13 permit for a while, and I don't know that I can support a
- 14 year. I think I can support some months.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: We're not there yet in
- 16 deliberations. We're still in the --
- 17 MR. BALL: Well, I would definitely go
- 18 bankrupt if I lost my hauler license any longer than I
- 19 have. We've made arrangements with all of our tire
- 20 stores. We process the tires there on-site and with the
- 21 anticipation that we're going to be renewed. It would be
- 22 devastating if we were not.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Well, Mr. Ball,
- 24 you did know, though, that you were not supposed to
- 25 violate the 500 tire rule. You've admitted that.

- 1 MR. BALL: I was under the impression that
- 2 once it was in a chip piece on the wall, that it was no
- 3 longer considered a tire. And that is the impression I
- 4 had from all throughout the deal. The chips on the wall
- 5 are nowhere near a tire. They're basically a little chip
- 6 of tire. It can be stacked in an un-uniform area and made
- 7 uniform.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: These aren't
- 9 chips, these are --
- 10 MR. BALL: No, sir. Those are
- 11 approximately seven-and-a-half-inch pieces. We remove the
- 12 sidewalls, and usually the sidewalls go to one of our
- 13 dairy people and then it leaves the tread part. And we
- 14 break those down in six or so pieces, right around a
- 15 seven-and-a-half-inch piece. I referred to that as a
- 16 chip. It is a piece.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Well, I think
- 18 you've had enough experience with this Board that you
- 19 should have known.
- MR. BALL: That's why I called Terry Smith.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I don't think
- 22 that -- I agree it's difficult for you to maneuver
- 23 government and through government, and that's why there
- 24 are people that make a lot of money dealing with
- 25 government for other people.

- 1 MR. BALL: I certainly do.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: But it's like you
- 3 may not know the whole Vehicle Code, but you certainly
- 4 have got an idea that it's out there and that it needs to
- 5 be adhered to.
- 6 MR. BALL: Well, I respectfully ask to have
- 7 my license renewed and pay some kind of a fine, double
- 8 probation, walking-on-glass-type of thing. That's where
- 9 we're at. We're facing bankruptcy and scandal if we can't
- 10 get this cleared up and that benefits nobody.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Where did you shred the
- 12 tires at?
- 13 MR. BALL: I did it at my house.
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: Where this is?
- MR. BALL: Right.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: So you stored the tires
- 17 there while they were shredded?
- 18 MR. BALL: They came in and they were
- 19 chopped and went right into the wall as they were going.
- 20 The ones that have steel in the sidewall we have do a
- 21 little bit different of a process on those because our
- 22 razor blades don't take out the steel and we usually let
- 23 those bunch up or it did bunch up to about a hundred of
- 24 them and we break out the Sawzalls and have to go about it
- 25 the hard way.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Any other
- 2 questions or does that complete your rebuttal?
- MR. BALL: That completes my rebuttal, I
- 4 guess.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Now you have five minutes
- 6 to make your final closing argument.
- 7 MR. BALL: That was my closing argument.
- 8 (Laughter)
- 9 MR. BALL: We honestly thought we were
- 10 permitted to have under 500. We did not believe that we
- 11 would be in trouble for building this wall. We thought it
- 12 was an exclusion. We asked the County about doing it --
- 13 or I don't mean an exclusion. We thought it was a
- 14 positive thing to do with it. We still do think that. We
- 15 did ask the County prior to doing it. We respectfully ask
- 16 to have our license.
- I have a tire store in Plymouth that we
- 18 would process our tires in. We have no problem with the
- 19 neighbors there, and we would like to go on about our
- 20 business, hire a civil engineer, do all the -- cover all
- 21 the bases and make you guys satisfied, come back down,
- 22 present this to you in a way that is orderly and proceed
- 23 at that point.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: One other question. Do
- 25 you have -- are you going to put in the exhibit, the civil

- 1 engineering and the bill? I haven't seen a copy of that.
- 2 Can I see a copy of that?
- 3 MR. BALL: As I said, the engineer came
- 4 out. He thought that was one of the neatest things he
- 5 ever saw. And I've called three times, left messages on
- 6 his machine, and he has not returned his call to me. And
- 7 the coffee shop talk in the area is that he's trying to do
- 8 this back east with some people with big money.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: If he does it in
- 10 California, he'd better get a permit.
- 11 (Laughter)
- 12 MR. BALL: That's right. And I'll tell him
- 13 that too, sir.
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: One thing. This says that
- 15 he came out on 7-29-99.
- 16 MR. BALL: Yes. Shortly after Cody and
- 17 Keith came out and said it had to be engineered if I was
- 18 to do something like that. Immediately after they came
- 19 out, I called the engineer and got him over there.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Our staff
- 21 questioned -- it was after our staff said it had to be
- 22 engineered that you called the engineer?
- MR. BALL: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. So you're
- 25 building this thing. You get information from our staff

- 1 that says you have -- this has to be engineered and you
- 2 call an engineer.
- 3 MR. BALL: Yes. I did nothing until I
- 4 talked to Terry, started on it, then we went around and
- 5 then Cody said -- and him and Keith came out that it had
- 6 to be engineered. I had mentioned to the County before
- 7 and they just we don't know, and then we had to call the
- 8 engineer and had him come in at that time.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: How many tires were in
- 10 place at that time or the pieces?
- 11 MR. BALL: The pieces. 340-something tons,
- 12 I guess, it was.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: So the wall was built.
- 14 MR. BALL: It was built and it was on the
- 15 verge of coming down.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's when you found
- 17 out from Terry it had to be engineered.
- MR. BALL: No.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: You found out before
- 20 you put the tires in there or after?
- 21 MR. BALL: I found out from Cody.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. Help me out.
- 23 Before or after?
- MR. BALL: After.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: After you put them in

1 there? 2 MR. BALL: Yes, sir. 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Thank you. Ms. Williams, your close. 6 MS. WILLIAMS: Mr. Chairman, I'll keep my 7 comments brief. I would just like to summarize for the Board that, as I'm sure you're aware, the issue that is before the Board today is the violation of 42951(b) which requires that a waste tire hauler who hauls waste tires using his registration to an unpermitted site has violated 11 the law, and that under 42959 and 42960, the Board has the 12 authority to deny any application for the reissuance or 13 renewal of a waste tire hauler registration. 14 15 The issue also is that, I believe, on the heels of a previous Board hearing to decide that precise 16 matter as well, and quite frankly while the Board was 17 having the proceedings, Mr. Ball was in the process of 18 creating the pile that we are deliberating over today. 19 20 He was first contacted in 1996 regarding 21 waste tire storage violations. He received two Cleanup and Abatement Orders which he failed to comply with, both leading to administrative penalty complaints, and he has 23 24 been through two administrative penalty hearings. One 25 arrived at a stipulated decision and the other resulted in

- 1 a decision from a judge. It is difficult to believe even
- 2 at the conclusion of those two hearings that Mr. Ball was
- 3 not perfectly aware that he is required to have some
- 4 permission, either from a local jurisdiction or the Board,
- 5 in order to have more than 500 waste tires on his site.
- 6 Further, if the Board would like to take
- 7 the opportunity to review the Administrative Complaint
- 8 9724 AC, it alleges that at the Fine and Sons waste site
- 9 he did indeed have tire shreds and he was informed by
- 10 Mr. Cambridge and also through those proceedings that even
- 11 for the storage of waste tire shreds he needed to have a
- 12 permit in order to store those tires on-site.
- 13 In essence, Mr. Ball's protestations that
- 14 he's unaware of the law and how it applies to him simply
- 15 doesn't hold water, and I think that it is possible that
- 16 past lenience by this Board has somehow given Mr. Ball the
- 17 impression that if he's got a good project going, he's
- 18 somehow going to be able to hedge his bets and finally get
- 19 his projects moving.
- 20 I think this particular hearing has
- 21 established that in fact Mr. Ball was informed by Terry
- 22 Smith that he did need to have either a local agency
- 23 agreement or permission or a civil engineer sign-off on
- 24 any project of this nature, also demonstrated by the fact
- 25 that prior to his creation of this particular site he did

- 1 go to the County for clearance and did not receive it. He
- 2 did contract with a civil engineer who did not give him
- 3 sign-off, and he was in constant contact with the Board
- 4 through the offices of Mr. Cambridge for the previous
- 5 denial action before the Board and throughout 1999
- 6 regarding this one.
- 7 I believe that Mr. Cambridge's enforcement
- 8 of the action before the Board for his 2000 waste tire
- 9 hauler registration indicates that the Board, through the
- 10 staff and the Board themselves, had bent over backwards to
- 11 give Mr. Ball to understand the state of the law, and it
- 12 is clear he does understand the state of the law.
- Despite economic disadvantages, these are
- 14 nothing compared -- economic advantages to Mr. Ball as a
- 15 result of his illegal activities, these are nothing
- 16 compared to the safety violations that his project
- 17 proposed. This is evidenced by the fact that Amador
- 18 County themselves came to the Waste Board to complain of
- 19 the site because they felt there was a significant health
- 20 and safety risk posed by this particular site.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Was that before our
- 22 last meeting or after?
- 23 MS. WILLIAMS: It was after your hearing as
- 24 testified by Mr. Cambridge.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And they complained

- 1 about his retaining site.
- 2 MS. WILLIAMS: Yes. At the West Clinton
- 3 Road site, and based on that complaint in June of 1999,
- 4 Mr. Cambridge and Mr. Cody Begley went out to investigate
- 5 the site with an Amador County employee, and despite the
- 6 fact this site has subsequently been cleaned up, it was
- 7 through the effort of many extensions, and I believe that
- 8 throughout all of these activities Mr. Ball has
- 9 demonstrated his ability to clean up the sites but his
- 10 reticence to comply with the letter of the law, and I
- 11 believe that in itself is sufficient to support a denial
- 12 of renewal of his registration.
- 13 It is difficult not to consider the fact
- 14 that perhaps his site presents some sort of opportunity,
- 15 but I request that the Board not consider this as an
- 16 opportunity necessarily to establish a new engineering
- 17 project but see it for what it is, which is someone who
- 18 absolutely stretched the limits of the law in order to
- 19 obtain -- not only stretched but exceeded the limits of
- 20 the law in order to obtain an economic advantage and that
- 21 is exactly why these sort of safety regulations and
- 22 statutes are in place to make sure that safety is never
- 23 sacrificed for the potential promise of a success of one
- 24 of these sites. That is also why it is required that
- 25 there be evaluation by the Board and by the County of

- 1 these sites, to make sure that those safety violations are
- 2 not exceeded.
- 3 Thank you.
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right.
- 5 Mr. Jones.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Ms. Williams.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Questions from the Board
- 8 Members?
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: You said that Amador
- 10 County contacted the Board and they were worried about --
- 11 they were worried about the hauling --
- 12 MS. WILLIAMS: They were worried -- I'm
- 13 sorry.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: -- to the site,
- 15 because in testimony it was that I heard earlier, I
- 16 thought it was about the hauling and now it's the site and
- 17 I'm wondering why did Amador County call again.
- 18 MS. WILLIAMS: I believe it was
- 19 Mr. Cambridge's testimony that Amador County, through
- 20 Margaret Blood, contacted the Waste Board regarding their
- 21 concern about the waste tires that were being stored at
- 22 the West Clinton Road facility. If I may confer. That's
- 23 correct.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. Any other
- 25 questions? Okay. That closes the proceedings and now

- 1 we'll issue a decision. We have a recommendation from
- 2 staff contained in Resolution 2000-61.
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Mr. Chairman.
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: Senator Roberti.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: To start the
- 6 proceedings, I'll make the motion to adopt Resolution
- 7 2000-61.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll
- 9 second.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Senator Roberti moves and
- 11 Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt Resolution
- 12 2000-61.
- 13 Madam Secretary, please call the --
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Question.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: There's no time in
- 17 this resolution. How long are we denying this permit for?
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Actually, it's not a
- 19 denial of the permit. It's actually the renewal of the
- 20 permit is my understanding.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: There's no time
- 22 involved. When does the operator or the hauler have the
- 23 opportunity to reapply for a permit?
- 24 MR. FITZGERALD: It would be an annual
- 25 permit, so November of next year as it would stand now.

- 1 November of this year. Excuse me.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: So ten months? Nine
- 3 months?
- 4 MR. FITZGERALD: It would be issued in
- 5 January, apply in November.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Can we amend the
- 7 resolution so -- or no time certain as to when he can
- 8 apply for a renewal. So assuming he gets his house in
- 9 order, he can come back here, no guarantees. Is there a
- 10 way --
- 11 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Well, I think the
- 12 question even goes further. I notice that you say well,
- 13 he can apply in November but it won't be effective until
- 14 January. I don't think we would want to say let him apply
- 15 in May, but it's not going to be effective until January.
- 16 We would have to make sure that if that was the desire --
- 17 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Could we tail the
- 18 resolution without prejudice to Mr. Ball's reapplying for
- 19 a permit and having it go into effect at any time 30 days
- 20 after adoption of the resolution? That would leave it up
- 21 to the discretion of the Board, as I read it. Assuming he
- 22 gets his house in order, assuming everybody agrees,
- 23 assuming he's still a good citizen on this matter, to
- 24 grant him a permit. Do you understand what I'm talking
- 25 about?

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: I do. I think the statute
- 2 doesn't really address the issue. I think once we -- if
- 3 we were to adopt your resolution, Mr. Ball is free to
- 4 submit whatever application he wants for the current year.
- 5 That's how I'm reading it. I think that's what you're
- 6 getting at.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That's probably -- I
- 8 want him to be able to come back assuming, for example, if
- 9 he can show that Amador County had agreed all along,
- 10 Amador County has mislead him, he suddenly has the
- 11 greatest engineering project since somebody got a slicer
- 12 on bread, whatever, or that he convinces us third time
- 13 around that he's for real and he's not doing any more
- 14 illegal hauling now or forever in the future. Nobody on
- 15 this Board I sense wants to do the distasteful thing of
- 16 having to put him out of business unless he's asking for
- 17 it through his actions. I would like to be able to
- 18 revisit this.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think we're free under
- 20 statute. I think if we try to put conditions on it that
- 21 he can't come back before a time, I think that's where we
- 22 get in trouble. I think that's it. I think your
- 23 resolution is --
- 24 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Let's just get
- 25 Kathryn to chip in on it.

- 1 MS. TOBIAS: I'm sorry. I was talking to
- 2 the Executive Director.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think the issue is, at
- 4 least -- excuse me if I may frame the issue -- is that
- 5 basically the Board, or at least the motion before us is
- 6 to not renew the waste tire hauler permit, but the Board
- 7 also doesn't or at least one or two Board Members think
- 8 they don't want any prejudice for Mr. Ball to be able to
- 9 come back in without setting any kind of time
- 10 restrictions. If he can come back next week and show he
- 11 has X, Y and Z and starts the renewal permit, that allows
- 12 for it. If it's 11 months, there's no time frame. The
- 13 question is really under the statute we cannot renew, but
- 14 without setting any conditions on it. I think that's kind
- 15 of what we're trying to go for, and I think the statute
- 16 basically says we have the power not to renew, but I don't
- 17 think the statute directs us that there's any kind of time
- 18 certain where he's prevented from coming back in should
- 19 circumstances change.
- 20 MS. TOBIAS: That's correct. The statute
- 21 basically says that the registration is valid from the
- 22 date of issuance to January 1st of the next year. So at
- 23 whatever point you issue the next one, if one were to be
- 24 issued, it would be valid for the rest of that year.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Can I ask the maker of
- 3 the motion a question? If -- and I like this motion. The
- 4 conditions, when you say put your house in order, because
- 5 I think all the shreds, all the tires have been removed
- 6 on-site now. We have a bear in site now; correct?
- 7 MS. WILLIAMS: The site is clean.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: So we've got a
- 9 clean -- this guy has a clean site. Put the house in
- 10 order. If this is the use he wants, get it engineered,
- 11 get it approved by the County --
- 12 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: If he can do all
- 13 that, I personally -- if he can show that his retention
- 14 wall has the proper county permits and he -- and therefore
- 15 the proper engineering to do it, I would be prepared to
- 16 vote for it because he doesn't have to come to the Waste
- 17 Board for that and I forgive past actions with the slap on
- 18 the wrist and that is what this, a temporary denial of the
- 19 permit, would be. But he's got to come and show
- 20 something.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: On the other hand, if we
- 22 do decide not to renew and Mr. Ball goes out next week and
- 23 starts hauling tires and gets cited, that goes against the
- 24 permit.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Absolutely.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: So there's a flip side to
- 3 it as well.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Absolutely,
- 5 engineering or not.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think that's what you're
- 7 talking about, house in order and those kinds of things.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Most important I'm
- 9 concerned that you show you're trying to evade the
- 10 authority of the Board by finding ways to hauling tires
- 11 where you shouldn't. Yes. If you get the end to -- thank
- 12 you -- because you have to dot every "I" in Mr. Ball's
- 13 case, I think. And yes, absolutely. The fact that you
- 14 may have an engineering permit and if while pending that
- 15 permit you're hauling in tires, no. That's a no-no. You
- 16 can't do that.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Well,
- 18 Mr. Chairman --
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: -- we're talking
- 21 about his hauling to that one site, but what he's being
- 22 charged with is hauling to an illegal site. We want to
- 23 make sure that he understands that it's not only to that
- 24 engineered site or what he considers an engineered site,
- 25 but to any illegal tire site.

1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Can't haul tires. 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: He just can't haul tires. 3 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I also think that while I don't want to put Mr. Ball out of business, I think that the last time he was here we did slap him on the wrist. This time we should at least make sure that he 7 realizes and has suffered some penalty here. He's cleaned this all up and he can come back in tomorrow and say I've cleaned it all up and here's my engineer. The engineer may answer his voice mail now and be back at this Board next month to have his permit. I think he needs to feel 11 the punishment. 12 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson. 14 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to be voting for non-renewal and I also certainly don't want to vote to put anyone out of business, but I'm very concerned, as Mr. Pennington is, that our staff has put in a tremendous amount of time on 18 19 this. There are other things that we have to do and this Board has, and I guess this is my first hearing with you, 21 but I certainly hope that Mr. Ball understands the law, gets everything that's necessary before he burdens our staff with this whole thing again and I don't know how we 23 do that. I'm concerned about that.

BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Maybe the way to

25

- 1 do that is I'll offer a substitute motion that says that
- 2 we adopt Resolution 2000-61 and deny the issuance of the
- 3 permit and restrict Mr. Ball from applying for a new
- 4 permit for at least three months.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: 90 days?
- 6 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: 90 days, yeah.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I'm glad to withdraw
- 8 the motion.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. Senator Roberti
- 10 withdraws his motion, and the second that was accompanying
- 11 thereto?
- 12 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: So you're free now.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington moves and
- 16 Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt Resolution
- 17 2000-61 with the -- amended as follows: That the renewal
- 18 for the application for renewal of the Waste Tire Hauler
- 19 Registration Number 0107 issued to MB Opportunities shall
- 20 be denied; and that MB Opportunities shall not be
- 21 permitted to reapply for a permit 90 days after the
- 22 effective date of this resolution.
- 23 Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- 24 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.

- BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 3 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 5 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 7 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- 9 Aye. Mr. Ball, do you understand what has
- 10 just taken place?
- 11 MR. BALL: Yeah. You just put me out of
- 12 business. Thank you.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay.
- 14 All right. Members, the representatives
- 15 for Item Number 36, which was the draft regulations to
- 16 place certain nonhazardous waste in a regulatory tier,
- 17 have graciously agreed they would like to accommodate us
- 18 and hear that after the lunch time break in order for us
- 19 to be able to get through some of the other sort of
- 20 non-controversial items so that other Board Members can
- 21 meet other commitments.
- 22 So with that in mind, if we could then go
- 23 to Item Number 42, 43, 44, 46 and 47 pretty quickly, if
- 24 that's possible, then we can break for lunch and then come
- 25 back and we'll pick up that Item Number 36 at that point.

- 1 So is the Local Assistance and Planning
- 2 Compliance Division here? Mr. Leary is. We'll take you.
- 3 Item Number 42.
- 4 MR. LEARY: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
- 5 and Members of the Board. My name Mark Leary representing
- 6 the Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Division.
- 7 Item 42 before you is consideration of
- 8 unincorporated area of Mono County's request for an
- 9 extension to their compliance order. The basis of this
- 10 extension is that Mono County is proposing to do a waste
- 11 generation study and hopes to complete that study when the
- 12 businesses are actually open in Mono County. Because the
- 13 compliance order requires that they complete that study
- 14 by, I believe, April or May of this year and the
- 15 businesses will not be open until the summer tourism
- 16 season has started, we are proposing to grant that
- 17 extension and recommend approval of that extension until
- 18 July 31st of this year so they may complete that work and
- 19 do the adequate job they hope to do.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones, you're familiar
- 21 intimately with this --
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Well, not as
- 23 intimately as Inyo, but on the 31st of July, will that be
- 24 enough time? Are they comfortable they can get their
- 25 stuff done?

- 1 MR. LEARY: Yes, they are.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, I would
- 3 like to move adoption of Resolution Number 2000-29.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Second.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Mr. Jones
- 7 moves and Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt
- 8 Resolution 2000-29.
- 9 Madam Secretary, please call the roll and
- 10 establish a roll call.
- 11 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 13 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 17 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 19 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- Next item, Item Number 43.
- 22 MR. LEARY: Item 43 is consideration of
- 23 City of Hawthorne's request for an extension to the
- 24 compliance order implementation date. I will turn that
- 25 over to Board staff member Zane Poulson for that

- 1 presentation.
- 2 MR. POULSON: Good morning or good
- 3 afternoon, Chairman Eaton and Members of the Board. I'm
- 4 Zane Poulson of the Office of Local Assistance, south
- 5 section.
- 6 On January 27th, 1999, the Board issued the
- 7 City of Hawthorne a compliance order for failing to
- 8 adequately demonstrate implementation of programs selected
- 9 in the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element or
- 10 SRRE. The compliance order specifically required the City
- 11 implement all programs listed in the SRRE by January 1st,
- 12 2000 or suitable alternatives, documented the City's
- 13 progress in quarterly reports to the Board, and work with
- 14 staff in the Office of Local Assistance to develop a
- 15 performance plan that the City will agree to implement.
- On March 30th, 1999, the City signed a
- 17 performance plan that included five specific programs the
- 18 City agreed to implement by the end of 1999. The City has
- 19 reported to the Board in their quarterly reports that they
- 20 are fully implementing four of the five tasks listed in
- 21 the performance plan, the only exception being the
- 22 multi-unit dwelling recycling program. The City has
- 23 reported to the Board in their quarterly reports they have
- 24 begun phasing in the multi-unit dwelling recycling program
- 25 but have not achieved full implementation of that program.

- 1 On December 22nd, 1999, the Board received
- 2 a formal request for an extension for full implementation
- 3 of the multi-unit dwelling recycling program until May
- 4 15th, 1999. The City states that the extension is
- 5 necessary due to complications in funding the program that
- 6 are a result of Proposition 218 requirements.
- 7 Because the City has reported in their
- 8 quarterly reports that they have completed four of the
- 9 five tasks required in their performance plan and that
- 10 they have begun phasing in of the multi-unit dwelling
- 11 program, and because they have reported that they are
- 12 implementing all other programs selected in their SRRE,
- 13 staff is recommending the Board grant the extension.
- 14 Yesterday afternoon, staff received a faxed
- 15 letter from Jerry Jamgotchian who wanted to address the
- 16 Board on the subject but was unable to attend the Board
- 17 meeting. Copies of the letter have been provided.
- 18 Charles Herbertson of the City of Hawthorne is available
- 19 to answer any questions the Board may have.
- 20 This concludes staff's presentation. Are
- 21 there any questions?
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of staff?
- 23 Okay.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I hate seeing 218 used
- 25 as a method for not getting a rate increase since there

- 1 was an exclusion dealing with solid waste in the bill. It
- 2 amazes me how it's always used to make sure it is -- it is
- 3 unbelievable.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman,
- 5 I'11 --
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: I take it that was not a
- 7 motion.
- 8 (Laughter)
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll give them the
- 10 extension. I'm just worried about 218 being a scapegoat
- 11 for not doing it when there was an exclusion for solid
- 12 waste activities in the law.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'll move
- 14 adoption of Resolution 2000-39 to approve City of
- 15 Hawthorne's request for an extension to a compliance order
- 16 program implementation due date.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll second it.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington moves and
- 19 Mr. Jones seconds that we adopt Resolution 2000-39.
- 20 Without objection, we'll substitute the
- 21 previous roll call. Hearing no objection, so shall be
- 22 ordered.
- 23 Item Number 44.
- 24 MR. SCHIAVO: Okay. Item 44 is
- 25 consideration -- this one is a slide show and --

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Good afternoon,
- 2 Mr. Schiavo.
- 3 MR. SCHIAVO: Good afternoon.
- 4 (Laughter)
- 5 MR. SCHIAVO: We jumped ahead. Is it
- 6 possible if we could do 47 before 44?
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure.
- 8 MR. SCHIAVO: Okay.
- 9 MR. LEARY: Item 47 is consideration of a
- 10 voluntary local jurisdiction assistance plan for Tahema
- 11 Regional Agency. Mr. Chairman, if you'll indulge me a
- 12 minute, as a little bit of a success story, we would like
- 13 to give some credit to staff and also to the folks at
- 14 Tahema Regional Agency for a job well done. Particularly
- 15 I would like to identify Heidi Sanborn and Kyle Pogue for
- 16 their efforts in working with this agency to get the
- 17 agreement out. Heidi was instrumental in establishing a
- 18 cooperative team relationship with folks and Regional
- 19 Agency members and set the stage for what was a
- 20 collaborative targeted implementation assistance plan.
- 21 I believe this plan has been highlighted in
- 22 several documents, or this program has been highlighted in
- 23 several documents, in fact, in sheets the Board has put
- 24 out recently, including the AB 939 report to the
- 25 legislature that the Board approved yesterday.

- 1 Kyle relatedly has worked as the county
- 2 agency liaison for the Division, has worked with Heidi and
- 3 worked with the agency to make this successful program
- 4 happen.
- 5 So I just wanted to acknowledge their
- 6 efforts and express management's appreciation for a job
- 7 well done, and I'll turn the presentation over to Kyle to
- 8 take it from there.
- 9 MR. POGUE: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
- 10 and Board Members. My name is Kyle Pogue. I'm with the
- 11 Office of Local Assistance. I'm basically here today to
- 12 tell you a story of how Tahema County transformed their
- 13 waste management program from top to bottom.
- 14 In 1995, Tahema County had some serious
- 15 issues with and problems with their landfill operator
- 16 which resulted in a BOE audit. They had program
- 17 implementation issues, disposal and diversion measurement
- 18 problems, and an overall communication problem in between
- 19 the jurisdictions within that county.
- 20 In response to those issues, Tahema County
- 21 officials met with Board staff and acknowledged they had
- 22 problems, and they acknowledged these problems in
- 23 particular and developed a plan to tackle that and
- 24 confront that issue.
- 25 This plan consisted of, first of all,

- 1 consulting with Board staff on appropriate components of a
- 2 waste hauler and landfill operator contract.
- 3 Additionally, they hired Bob Kohn, who is here today, as a
- 4 new solid waste manager. Once Bob came on, he did a
- 5 number of things to improve the waste management program.
- 6 He helped form a regional agency with all the
- 7 jurisdictions within the county. The Regional Agency
- 8 helped eliminate allocation problems and produced a better
- 9 level of communication between those jurisdictions.
- 10 They established a new base year. They
- 11 hired a new contractor for operation of the Red Bluff
- 12 landfill and waste services for the cities of Red Bluff,
- 13 Tahema and the unincorporated area of Tahema County.
- 14 Additionally, they asked for help from the Office of Local
- 15 Assistance Targeted Implementation Assistance Section.
- 16 Through -- voluntarily they came to the
- 17 Board to do this and worked with Board staff to determine
- 18 program areas that needed to be addressed. These areas
- 19 included five different program areas. One would be to
- 20 develop procurement policies and consider the use of
- 21 rubberized asphalt concrete. Number two is public
- 22 education efforts and school recycling programs. Number
- 23 three is investigating options for the diversion of food
- 24 waste. Number four is performing waste assessments for
- 25 the largest commercial agricultural generators and

- 1 implementing commercial diversion programs. And the last
- 2 one was expanding green waste diversion programs
- 3 throughout the county.
- I just want to say on a personal note it
- 5 really has been a pleasure to work with Bob Kohn and his
- 6 staff in Tahema County, as well as the local decision
- 7 makers there, as well as the local waste haulers. I would
- 8 like to also thank various Board staff members for coming
- 9 on board to work with that, but I would like to
- 10 specifically mention Heidi Sanborn and the work she's
- 11 done, not only in Tahema County but in a number of other
- 12 counties around the state. She deserves a lot of credit
- 13 for this.
- 14 At this point I would like to introduce Bob
- 15 Kohn, solid waste manager for the Tahema County Regional
- 16 Agency, and he's going to discuss their programs and what
- 17 he sees in the future for Tahema County.
- Thank you.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you.
- Mr. Kohn, welcome.
- 21 MR. KOHN: Do I need to repeat my name and
- 22 stuff for the Board?
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: It would be good if you
- 24 would be kind enough to do so.
- 25 MR. KOHN: My name is Robert Kohn. I'm the

- 1 solid waste manager for the Tahema County Regional Joint
- 2 Powers Agency, and I want to say hello to the Board and
- 3 Chairman. I appreciate being invited here.
- I don't know how much I can add to what
- 5 Kyle has said, but I would like to thank the Board
- 6 basically for allowing the Office of Local Assistance and
- 7 the TIA section to spend time with me and the County.
- 8 Honestly I don't know that the County would be in the
- 9 position they're in had they not been able to do that.
- 10 The sources of information and the databases that have
- 11 been helped have been a tremendous help to me, ideas on
- 12 things to do.
- 13 As far as the TIA agreement, we're
- 14 continuing to work on those things. I just did a waste
- 15 assessment on January 13th with Mercy High School, which
- 16 is a Catholic school. If they implement what was
- 17 recommended, they will reduce their waste by 50 percent.
- 18 So we're still continuing to work on those things.
- We have come a long way, and I think the
- 20 year 2000 should be a big year for the regional agencies.
- 21 We have several projects in place or coming online we
- 22 hope. A Materials Recovery Facility is scheduled to be
- 23 complete by July 2000. Compost facility, we just recently
- 24 received a grant through the ESJPA for two agricultural
- 25 used oil centers. That's going to move along. Hopefully

- 1 that will come online in July as well.
- We also have a VOP in the south county, a
- 3 homeowners association we hope to have online. There's
- 4 4,000 people in that area and it's remote, and honestly I
- 5 didn't even know they were there.
- 6 (Laughter)
- 7 MR. KOHN: They don't -- they have to drive
- 8 21 miles just to have their oil changed. It's a big
- 9 problem, so we're addressing that. Also I am working with
- 10 franchise haulers to do something more on Earth Day and
- 11 Recycle Week and things like that. This county hasn't
- 12 done much of that in the past, but that's going well. We
- 13 should have some events this next year.
- 14 We also hope to address household hazardous
- 15 waste. The County has been holding annual events. Those
- 16 are very expensive. We're trying to do something on a
- 17 more permanent basis, and I even got the Board to agree to
- 18 spend \$40,000 a year for that cause. So we will see what
- 19 we can do with that. We also hope to address waste tires.
- 20 That is a real problem in rural counties and Tahema County
- 21 is no exception. So we hope to do that.
- 22 Those are the things we're planning for
- $23\ \ 2000$ among the other things we're still trying to do, and
- 24 I just wanted to again thank the Board for allowing the
- 25 staff to spend the time helping us. I think that was

- 1 great.
- I think one other thing I'm going to add,
- 3 since state agencies tend to get criticized, when I call
- 4 the Waste Board, I generally get a person. And if I
- 5 don't, I always get a return phone call. So I would like
- 6 to compliment your staff for that. Some state agencies
- 7 you call, you're lucky to get a person. So I like that.
- 8 Thank you.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Mr. Chairman.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Senator Roberti.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Pursuant to what our
- 13 witness is saying, it gives me the chance to say
- 14 something. I have heard that as well from people who call
- 15 us and saying that I just hope our policy in the future
- 16 isn't such that -- and maybe this will be very unpopular
- 17 with staff -- that we don't have at-home programs so much
- 18 as we did in my agency when I was with the Unemployment
- 19 Board where if you wanted to call somebody -- it was a
- 20 fine board -- you fought on the voice mail all the time.
- 21 One of the reasons for that was that we
- 22 were so generous with the at-home program that that made
- 23 sense when members were talking amongst themselves or
- 24 members wanted to talk to staff, but when the public wants
- 25 to talk to people, the at-home program doesn't work. It

- 1 really only works when we have intra-agency conversation,
- 2 and we have to take that into consideration.
- 3 So I'm just throwing this out. It's no
- 4 peeve at all with our current Board, but it is something
- 5 that I experienced when I moved into the bureaucracy from
- 6 the legislature. And I'm just throwing that out to the
- 7 Members that when we talk about at-home programs, which
- 8 are wonderful and convenience staff, we could lose the
- 9 positive input we got from the gentleman who just spoke if
- 10 at the same time when the public calls they get voice
- 11 mail. That doesn't happen here, but I've been in an
- 12 agency where it does happen. It is the most frustrating,
- 13 horrible thing for a constituent to have to deal with.
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 16 Chairman Eaton. I just wanted to thank you for coming
- 17 down and letting us know that. I've heard just wonderful
- 18 things about our TIA team, and since I'm relatively new, I
- 19 would really like the opportunity to go out with them
- 20 sometime. It's been really impressive. So thank you for
- 21 taking the time to come and let us know.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. In terms of
- 23 measurement when we started, is there any measurement from
- 24 when we began or we hope to have and what would that be?
- 25 MR. SCHIAVO: I don't have that off the top

- 1 of my head. Kyle?
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: I don't understand why.
- 3 You've only got a few hundred jurisdictions to keep there.
- 4 (Laughter)
- 5 MR. KOHN: When I arrived in '97, January
- 6 of '97 is when I accepted the position there, the
- 7 jurisdictions were at a negative 19 to a negative 38
- 8 percent diversion, and with the base year and the programs
- 9 in place, we're at 47 percent positive diversion. So
- 10 yeah, it's quite a swing.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: So the programs, the
- 12 measurement, although we get criticized a lot for numbers,
- 13 as you get into some of the program development, the
- 14 manifestation really is the success of the program.
- MR. KOHN: You can see the effect of the
- 16 programs in the tonnage received at the landfills, 49,000
- 17 tons to 42,000 in a three-year period. So it's
- 18 significant and the programs do work.
- Thank you.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you, and thank you
- 21 for a job well done.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Congratulations.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Mr. Schiavo,
- 24 do you think we can get through Item 44 and 46 before
- 25 12:30, and then the intent is to resume at 2:00. That

- 1 would just leave us with a couple remaining items.
- MR. SCHIAVO: Good morning, Board Members.
- 3 I'm here today to present our AB 735 implementation plan
- 4 to you. I'll give you an overview of it first.
- 5 It was signed into law on October 10th,
- 6 1999 and became effective January 1st, 2000. It mandates
- 7 that local state agencies divert 25 percent of all their
- 8 generation by 2002 and 50 percent by 2004. It requires
- 9 each state agency or large state facility appoint a
- 10 recycling coordinator within that state agency, and it
- 11 also -- the law sunsets in January 1st, 2006.
- 12 The participants as defined in law include
- 13 large state offices, departments, divisions, boards,
- 14 commissions, community colleges, state colleges and large
- 15 state facilities. It encourages the university system to
- 16 be part of the program. However, it does not mandate that
- 17 they are.
- Now, with some of the terminology you see
- 19 here, it's a little bit confusing in that there's some
- 20 redundancy in the way we treat our terminology in that for
- 21 instance, our Board contains divisions and offices, and
- 22 for that reason we wanted to clean up that terminology and
- 23 make it more clear to the participants. So we're
- 24 recommending that a state agency be defined as the highest
- 25 level of a specific organization. So therefore, the Board

- 1 would be the entity reporting, not a division of the Board
- 2 or an office of the Board.
- 3 Developing a plan, we're looking at the
- 4 plan to identifying the focuses on program identification.
- 5 It also includes generation numbers and diversion. We're
- 6 trying to model the plan after our experiences with the
- 7 implementation of AB 939, and what we did is we looked at
- 8 the existing SRRE process and then tried to glean out the
- 9 most pertinent parts of the SRRE process. By doing that,
- 10 we've actually condensed this proposed plan to a
- 11 requirement of maybe five to six pages that would be
- 12 submitted as a plan as opposed to some of the SRREs which
- 13 are hundreds of pages. I think we could have effectively
- 14 done that. So we're trying to keep it brief and concise.
- We disseminated the plan out to 50 state
- 16 departments, and some of those plans actually got
- 17 disseminated out to another 150 entities. So we received
- 18 some comments back in which we incorporated to date into
- 19 this plan.
- 20 We've tried to address the terminology
- 21 issues because there's -- a lot of times there's
- 22 duplication of terminology or different uses of the
- 23 terminology, so we kept this plan -- the terminology to be
- 24 very similar with the existing annual report system that's
- 25 set up for local jurisdictions. That way we can transfer

- 1 information back and forth easier. There's a current
- 2 familiarity. We already have databases set up to actually
- 3 be able to handle that.
- In developing the plan, there's some
- 5 benefits for the state agencies as well as local
- 6 jurisdictions and that way you can get the biggest bang
- 7 for your buck in which you identify what you have, where
- 8 you need to go, and also the plan will assist us in
- 9 conveying that information to the local jurisdictions and
- 10 so we can have a better focused effort in diverting from
- 11 the state facilities. So there will be benefits in this
- 12 once we obtain the information.
- 13 The time line, it's a relatively tight time
- 14 frame for implementing of the plan. In January 2000 --
- 15 well, it's the presentation today. February 15th, the
- 16 plan is to be disseminated to these state agencies. In
- 17 March 2000, later March and April, we're planning on
- 18 having -- conducting workshops throughout the state -- and
- 19 I'll address that in a few minutes -- as well as in April
- 20 through July, we're going to be having outreach assistance
- 21 to the state agencies and facilities, helping them fill
- 22 out the plan, helping them identify programs, helping them
- 23 coordinate with local jurisdictions as well.
- 24 July 15th, the participant plans are to be
- 25 submitted to the Board and we begin the review process.

- 1 And in January of 2001, we are to have a completed review
- 2 and approved process. So again, it's a real tight time
- 3 frame. Commencing April 2002, we're to begin an annual
- 4 report process, again somewhat similar to the existing
- 5 process we have with the local jurisdictions.
- 6 Regarding the AB 57 workshops, we're
- 7 proposing that workshops later March, and in April, we're
- 8 proposing the workshops are going to be conducted on a
- 9 regional basis. The workshops will deal with like
- 10 facility types such as Department of Corrections
- 11 facilities, we would deal with that as a group, offices as
- 12 a group, Caltrans facilities projects as a group, because
- 13 again there's a lot of similarities and people can share
- 14 their experiences so that we can leverage the information
- 15 a little better that way.
- 16 We're going to be looking at what are the
- 17 plan requirements, how do we fill out a plan, walking
- 18 through that, how do they identify their waste streams.
- 19 Again, look at the biggest-bang-for-the-buck programs, and
- 20 then find out what kind of future assistance do they want
- 21 so when we commence the outreach process.
- 22 The Board last calendar year approved a
- 23 contract concept for an awards program for local or for
- 24 state facilities, and we're looking at opportunities to
- 25 tie that into the jurisdictional efforts so in the future

- 1 you'll be seeing a contract concept regarding that. It's
- 2 going to recognize the outstanding programs, promote
- 3 diversion locality within a city or county, and it's going
- 4 to look similar, at least conceptually at this point, to
- 5 the trash cutter awards.
- 6 That's it. It's 27 after.
- 7 (Laughter)
- 8 MR. SCHIAVO: Any questions?
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Mr. Chairman.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Senator Roberti.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Not specifically a
- 12 question of Mr. Schiavo, but I certainly want his input on
- 13 this. AB 75 is going to go a long way toward giving state
- 14 agencies credibility. However, my question is why -- is
- 15 there anything we can do about the fact that local
- 16 jurisdictions either are credited or debited with the
- 17 diversion rate of the state agency? It doesn't make any
- 18 sense in my mind. We should set -- if we really want to
- 19 implement this, they should be responsible on their own
- 20 and the university should have its little category and
- 21 department of whatever. The federal agency should have
- 22 their little category so that the spotlight can glare on
- 23 them rather than the universities sort of being in Davis
- 24 or Berkeley or UCLA and getting mixed up with the local
- 25 jurisdictions. We miss the enforcement potential.

- My question therefore is, is there anything
- 2 that we can do so that the state agencies report on their
- 3 own, independent of the local jurisdictions they're in?
- 4 The local jurisdiction should neither be credited nor
- 5 debited with what the state agencies do now that we have a
- 6 full-fledged state agency program that's in operation or
- 7 are we stuck by statute to have to report through the
- 8 local government mechanism?
- 9 MR. SCHIAVO: Currently under existing
- 10 statute they're to report within the existing local
- 11 government system. However, with AB 75 we will also have
- 12 an indicator of what the individual state agencies are
- 13 reporting.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Okay. So we will
- 15 have a formalized program for the state agencies.
- MR. SCHIAVO: Yes.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I would suggest,
- 18 however, that in the future, certainly for the future for
- 19 statute, this Board should seek to have state agencies or
- 20 federal agencies exempted out of the local government's
- 21 diversion rates, either to give them credit or to debit
- 22 them because it makes no sense. They have no authority,
- 23 so why in the world is that part of their diversion rate?
- 24 It doesn't represent what they're doing or not doing.
- 25 So Mr. Chairman, I quess I would like for

- 1 the Board at some soon future date to consider
- 2 recommending statute to the legislature along those lines,
- 3 or if we could just direct the staff to come back within
- 4 90 days on that one point.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: You could do that as well.
- 6 There's just a couple of instances where I think, you
- 7 know, if that's something that you desire to direct staff
- 8 to bring back an item, that's fine as well. I don't have
- 9 a problem. I think you're going to -- personally, I think
- 10 you're going to run into complications due to that fact
- 11 because why should any person, generator of a waste stream
- 12 or not, participate? Then the issue becomes what about
- 13 local schools. Because the schools themselves -- I agree.
- 14 I have, I believe, a way that we can hook in the state
- 15 agencies in lieu of a statute, but that's not to say that
- 16 we shouldn't proceed with your idea.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Schools are more
- 18 difficult.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: So I think, and this is
- 20 just personally speaking, that through the SB 1066
- 21 extension program by which we will take into
- 22 consideration, hopefully as we examine our criteria, that
- 23 if there is a state agency that is adversely impacting a
- 24 local jurisdiction, that that local jurisdiction then
- 25 should be given the benefit of the doubt as it relates to

- 1 a good faith effort to comply. I'm not saying in lieu of
- 2 what you're doing --
- 3 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I understand. I
- 4 just want to start the ball rolling --
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: -- in this whole
- 7 area. One other thing -- and I don't want to hog up all
- 8 the time, but -- and why I'm bringing it up now because it
- 9 came up with my conversation in my briefing that I had
- 10 with Member Moulton-Patterson and Mr. Schiavo, is that I
- 11 would like to see us collate all the programs that we
- 12 engage in, and especially the local governments engage in,
- 13 to -- in which the diversion rate includes programs
- 14 dealing with waste reduction for multi-unit families and
- 15 commercial buildings, commercial businesses.
- My strong feeling is that since we don't
- 17 mandate what the local governments do, the overwhelming
- 18 burden of reducing the waste stream for landfills is on
- 19 homeowners and almost minimally on the multi-family units
- 20 and commercial buildings. How this came up $\operatorname{--}$ and it came
- 21 up in this conversation that I had with Mr. Schiavo on
- 22 this item and that's why I'm raising it now and it's
- 23 somewhat related. I received a call from the Senate --
- 24 the Legislative Joint Audit Committee yesterday asking for
- 25 my opinion on Sunshine Canyon, which I'm glad I don't have

- 1 to have an official opinion on that --
- 2 (Laughter)
- 3 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: -- because
- 4 nevertheless, nevertheless they were surprised to realize
- 5 that most of the dumping that's going to go on at Sunshine
- 6 Canyon, which frankly I think is a state-of-the-art waste
- 7 facility, even though if I were probably on the city
- 8 council I wouldn't have voted for it, in Los Angeles is
- 9 going to be from commercial and multi-unit housing simply
- 10 because the City of L.A. has almost no programs dealing
- 11 with commercial multi-unit. They're trying to squeeze the
- 12 turnip so that it's the homeowner who pays almost the
- 13 exclusive burden of keeping the state grain.
- 14 We don't seem to have too many programs
- 15 because we don't mandate the cities to do anything. Then
- 16 the cities say that's all that we can do is we go after
- 17 the homeowner. That's not true. I would like to collate
- 18 all the various programs that we have, all the various
- 19 things that we encourage cities to do to have commercial
- 20 and multi-family units recycle, reuse and reduce -- having
- 21 agreed to reverse the hierarchy I guess -- and also what
- 22 local cities do.
- 23 Obviously cities that are exclusively
- 24 commercial like Vernon and Industry and maybe Commerce
- 25 even, just to mention the ones I know in southern

- 1 California, must have programs that deal with an awful lot
- 2 of commercial waste, and it's really an issue that has not
- 3 come to our attention simply because we have felt that we
- 4 should -- shouldn't mandate locals, but I think we could
- 5 have a revolution brewing because I see it happen in Los
- 6 Angeles right now where suddenly the homeowners are
- 7 scratching their heads and wondering well, why we need
- 8 more landfills? And then they look at the fact that
- 9 multi-family units and commercial buildings don't have to
- 10 do anything. That's why you need more landfills, because
- 11 we're trying to squeeze the homeowner exclusively.
- 12 It came up with my conversation with
- 13 Mr. Schiavo on this item, so therefore I'm asking that we
- 14 collate all the various programs that we have and that
- 15 local governments have so that we start letting the world
- 16 know that the hierarchy can be reached by pressuring
- 17 multi-family units and commercial buildings, as well as
- 18 other agencies in government, every bit as much as it can
- 19 by pressing the homeowner who up until now has borne the
- 20 brunt; not just the brunt, but the overwhelming obligation
- 21 for keeping the state grain.
- 22 So I would like to collate those programs
- $23\,$ and ask that we have, say within $60\,$ days, the staff come
- 24 back to us with a list of those programs as well and
- 25 recommendations, too.

```
1 CHAIRMAN EATON: As you well know, we have
```

- 2 had some funding sources for the multi-family, if I'm not
- 3 mistaken.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I didn't know that
- 5 and thank you for telling me.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: But I think the one thing,
- 7 too, as I understand, and I believe that I just heard on
- 8 the news, I may have made a mistake. I think the County
- 9 of Sacramento has just implemented a program.
- MR. SCHIAVO: Yeah, and there's --
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Again, this is not to take
- 12 away with what you've asked for and that. I do believe,
- 13 however, that the one thing, too, is that we do have an
- 14 ability with -- and I'm not going to go back to 1066 --
- 15 but we all lack the statutory authority, but the meantime,
- 16 in the interim, once we have the master list, we can go
- 17 and analyze. For instance, if there is 70 percent
- 18 residential in a community and let's say that they're
- 19 falling below their line, and out of that 70 percent, 80
- 20 percent are multi-family, we have the ability within 1066
- 21 under the corrective action program to ask them to
- 22 implement that program. That is a back doorway to get to
- 23 what you have. I don't know if we can -- but that's
- 24 within our bounds until we're able to --
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Is that something

- 1 that we can mandate, and I thank you, but I think
- 2 something we should do as well is that -- I know this
- f 3 happens where I live -- is the impression is given very,
- 4 very strongly that well, we have no authority to do
- 5 anything other than go after the homeowner. That's a way
- 6 of keeping the homeowner appeased and not too angry. I
- 7 think we should just shed the light that there is a lot
- 8 more authority around, and I think it's our job to let the
- 9 world know what we can do and what the law requires or
- 10 doesn't require and what programs are out there and then
- 11 let the local politicians take the heat if they choose to
- 12 or don't choose to. I would just like to collate these
- 13 programs in the line also of what you're saying, letting
- 14 the world know we have some operating room within 1066.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I agree with you a
- 17 hundred percent. I think one thing we have to be really
- 18 aware of and one of the things I always bring up, when we
- 19 do base year adjustments and we continually raise that
- 20 bar, it makes it easier for local governments not to
- 21 implement the programs. Part of the good faith effort and
- 22 part of the 1066 is show us what you're doing -- forget
- 23 the number. Show us what you're doing to show good faith.
- Like Mr. Eaton just said, if you've got a
- 25 percentage break -- and I've found in offering programs,

- 1 it depends on the voter base. You've got a lot of
- 2 homeowners and not a lot of strong industrial,
- 3 manufacturing or commercial. The burden of the rate is
- 4 going to go on them. If it's -- it depends on how you do
- 5 it. A lot of jurisdictions are real square about it.
- 6 They equally do it and they want programs for every one of
- 7 those things, but I've always found that somebody says
- 8 they -- somebody that says we can't do it, we don't have
- 9 the authority, the only point they're missing that we
- 10 don't want to do it. That's -- and that's why we have to
- 11 stay true to good faith effort and the programs to do it.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Linda has a --
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
- 15 Mr. Chair. As a new Board Member, I would be very
- 16 interested in the presentation as it came out in our
- 17 briefing. I'm really interested in the commercial and the
- 18 multi-family, what we're doing. I don't know what we can
- 19 do and all that. I'm also really interested in the point
- 20 that Senator Roberti made about the state institutions
- 21 being -- having a separate track, but I wouldn't want to
- 22 pull the rug out from cities that have worked very hard
- 23 with some of these institutions where it's helped them.
- 24 So I would like to see how that works because it could
- 25 work both ways, either hurt or help. So I would like to

- 1 see that in your presentation and whatever you would be
- 2 doing for us. I don't mean to build your work load or
- 3 anything, but it would be very helpful.
- 4 MR. SCHIAVO: Again, the plans are due in
- 5 July and that will contain the information for the state
- 6 facilities, who they are, what they're doing, the amount
- 7 of existing diversion, and that would provide us an awful
- 8 lot of good information rather than having to build it
- 9 from scratch.
- 10 MR. CHANDLER: Let me keep this dialogue
- 11 going a little bit since I want to make sure that
- 12 expectations are met because I heard a 60-day clock and
- 13 now I'm hearing July, and the worst thing we can do here
- 14 is walk away and have different expectations. The
- 15 request, as I understand it, and I want to get back to the
- 16 state facilities issue because I want to make sure if
- 17 you're looking for legislation or are you looking for a
- 18 report or an agenda item, but let's go first to the second
- 19 one.
- 20 Programs that are out there, I would like
- 21 an inventory, let's collate, let's list, a listing of all
- 22 the programs. Now, I've heard state and I've heard local.
- 23 We can clearly in 60 days give you a listing of the state
- 24 programs. That's easy. I think what Pat's getting at is
- 25 for us to list all of the local programs by jurisdiction,

- 1 by sector -- industrial, commercial, residential,
- 2 multi-family, agriculture, what have you -- can best be
- 3 derived from when the plans come in. The plans are coming
- 4 in in July, unless we go back to old data. Frankly, I can
- 5 tell if you we start down this path, this is going to
- 6 redirect significant resources away from the plan reviews
- 7 while we kind of pour through all of the jurisdictions'
- 8 plans --
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: No, I don't want to
- 10 do that, but it is relevant to the plan reviews.
- 11 MR. CHANDLER: It is relevant. I think
- 12 what Pat's --
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Until I've sort of
- 14 focused on this -- I'm just thinking out loud.
- MR. CHANDLER: Sure.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Until I start
- 17 focusing on this, I frankly probably have been as easy
- 18 going on the local jurisdictions as anybody on the Board
- 19 has been, but I'm starting to think that I have never
- 20 really asked them what are you doing as far as your
- 21 commercial or multi-family units are concerned programs.
- 22 I know I didn't ask that in Lakewood. Now, I don't think
- 23 Lakewood has too much. I think if there's a single-family
- 24 city, it's Lakewood. Nevertheless, it should have been a
- 25 question that was asked because it would have had some

- 1 relevance. Maybe they have programs.
- 2 So my point is yes, as -- I don't want to
- 3 take the time of what this main role of our staff has got
- 4 to be and that's come up with recommendations for us on
- 5 the 50 percent diversion 2000, but it is sort of relevant
- 6 in my mind as to whether I'm going to be hard or soft. If
- 7 I see a jurisdiction only banging the homeowners over the
- 8 head where they are -- where 60 percent of their waste
- 9 stream is commercial or multi-family unit, of course
- 10 you're having a problem. You're refusing to go after your
- 11 campaign contributors, not to be too brutally honest about
- 12 it.
- 13 (Laughter)
- 14 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And as long as the
- 15 homeowners are in the dark and don't realize that this is
- 16 the case, they're not going to complain.
- 17 MR. CHANDLER: Pat, is there a -- speak up
- 18 here. Is there a relatively by April 1st easy way to
- 19 inventory the -- collate was the word -- both state and
- 20 local programs by multi-family and commercial or you
- 21 immediately jumped to the July submittals.
- 22 MR. SCHIAVO: Well, there's two elements.
- 23 One is July submittals for the state programs. Before
- 24 that, the information will just not be very good. We can
- 25 utilize the existing program database that we get from the

- 1 submittals of the annual reports for the jurisdiction
- 2 programs, and those are broken down by residential
- 3 programs, by commercial programs. So we can glean that
- 4 information readily. It's available.
- 5 MR. CHANDLER: Okay.
- 6 MR. SCHIAVO: Regarding the percentage of
- 7 commercial residential breakdowns, we have that for a lot
- 8 of communities based on the original Source Reduction
- 9 Recycling Elements and we have used that in the base year
- 10 adjustments when we look at the generation, pounds per
- 11 person per day figure that we use, so we have a better
- 12 indicator for that. So we won't have all of that
- 13 information, but we'll have a portion of that. We'll have
- 14 the program information for the local jurisdictions. And
- 15 again, the state programs, I just -- I have a problem with
- 16 that before the July submittals because of the lack of
- 17 accuracy for a lot of that.
- 18 MR. CHANDLER: So, Mr. Chairman, Senator
- 19 Roberti, 60 days. If we had this ready by April 1st, are
- 20 you suggesting we provide it in written form or do you
- 21 want it to come back before the Board? And by that I'm
- 22 suggesting with the April Board meeting, which obviously
- 23 is greater than 60 days, but remember you've got these
- 24 three weeks of --
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: The April Board

- 1 meeting is fine.
- 2 MR. CHANDLER: All right. Pat, does that
- 3 seem reasonable? And I've heard this only with collating,
- 4 but with recommendations, and I think right now we're
- 5 looking at using the 1066 process as at least one avenue
- 6 to be evaluating jurisdictions' performance in these
- 7 areas. We need to do some additional thinking as well.
- 8 I'd like to talk about the state institutions --
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Let me take an arrow out
- 10 of Ms. Moulton-Patterson's quiver that we used yesterday.
- 11 My understanding is that the 1066 program discussion for
- 12 the Board Members after the workshops are coming back in
- 13 the April meeting?
- 14 MR. SCHIAVO: March or April is what we
- 15 talked about.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: April meeting. If we can
- 17 combine both of those, those would seem to be a relevant
- 18 thing because then you can look at all of the programs
- 19 that deal with locals and we look at what we want to do
- 20 with corrective action, and that would fit within your
- 21 time frame.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That's fine.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: The April meeting that you
- 24 were --
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Fine. April is

- 1 enough time. It's not so deep into the year so if it is a
- 2 factor in whether we have compliance orders or whatever to
- 3 deal with --
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: That will just be general
- 5 discussion of how we want to frame the extension processes
- 6 based upon the input so we'll be able to see what programs
- 7 are available and kind of gives us a nice inventory
- 8 because we'll need the information anyway. We won't be
- 9 able to frame anything if we don't have the information,
- 10 so it sort of dovetails. If it can be done earlier, I'm
- 11 happy with that too as well, as long as we have it in time
- 12 for the 1066 discussion.
- 13 MR. CHANDLER: So that would include the
- 14 analysis around the state facilities as well. What I'm
- 15 hearing is instead of a separate exercise we're being
- 16 asked for here today, what you're couching it could be one
- 17 and the same, the analysis we're talking about and the
- 18 public institutions.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: It could be one and
- 20 the same because it is -- in my mind, it's all relevant to
- 21 how I'm going to vote on extensions.
- 22 MR. CHANDLER: Okay. Very good. I'm
- 23 clear, Pat. Are you? I want to make sure we walk away
- 24 and get headed in the right direction here.
- 25 MR. SCHIAVO: At this point I believe I'm

- 1 clear, and if there are any questions --
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: You can always come back.
- 3 MR. SCHIAVO: -- I can come back and
- 4 clarify them.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. I have two
- 6 speakers, believe it or not, and then this will be the
- 7 last item before the lunch break contrary to previous
- 8 qualifications. Mr. Gary Liss and then Mr. Evan Edgar, if
- 9 he's still here. Yes, he is.
- 10 MR. LISS: Mr. Chairman and Members of the
- 11 Board, thank you for the opportunity to speak here today
- 12 on this subject. Given the time, I'll try to be as brief
- 13 as possible. My name is Gary Liss, President of Gary Liss
- 14 and Associates, a recycling consultant based in Loomis,
- 15 California. I've been working with several clients on C&D
- 16 issues and issues that affect state agencies and wanted to
- 17 address some issues that in reviewing the model plan and
- 18 the item before you have come up.
- 19 First of all, AB 75 offers great
- 20 opportunity for greater diversion and greater buying
- 21 recycled materials from state agencies, and we're thrilled
- 22 to see that. Local governments throughout the state have
- 23 been calling for this for a decade and we're thrilled that
- 24 with your leadership and the Governor's leadership and the
- 25 legislature's continued interest in this it has happened.

- 1 The questions are number one, and probably 2 the most significant one, is will AB 75 apply to projects of state agencies, for example, highway projects of Caltrans? In talking with staff, we've heard differing views from different staff of the Board. It doesn't pertain to your action today, but rather the 7 implementation thereafter, so as you go and define what state agencies have to do, we want to make sure from a local government perspective that projects of state agencies are clearly articulated as required to be governed by AB 75. We have multi-million dollar highway 11 projects in L.A., in the San Francisco Bay area which should be governed by this and we want to make sure are. 13 14 Secondly, which state agencies will be covered? Will state courts, commissions like the Public Utilities Commission? Evidently different laws treat the 16 17 exemption of what's exempt and what's in differently. We would like to see as broad an interpretation of that. The 18 19 language in the bill says as the Board, the Waste Board 20 determines is the definition for the purposes of this act. 21 So we would like to see you include as many state agencies
- 24 Similar to the issue that Senator Roberti

the Public Utilities Commission.

as you feel comfortable, including the state courts and

22

23

25 raised about local government and state interaction, we

- 1 would like to encourage state agencies to coordinate
- 2 directly with local governments where they are located;
- 3 one, to identify the services and resources that are
- 4 available from local governments; and two, to report to
- 5 local governments on what they're doing. A lot of
- 6 state -- the frustration of the past decade has been that
- 7 the local governments haven't -- even if they know there's
- 8 recycling going on by state agencies, they can't get
- 9 information to include it to you in their annual reports.
- 10 So as part of your guidance going forward in this, please
- 11 ask state agencies to report information to local
- 12 governments, and at a minimum have the state agency or the
- 13 Waste Board provide a copy of the plan that the state
- 14 agency submits to you to every local government recycling
- 15 coordinator that will be impacted where they have
- 16 facilities.
- 17 Fourth, recommend that the model
- 18 implementation plan requirements be addressed in
- 19 subsequent revisions of the model plan that's presented to
- 20 you. As I understand it, the model plan is supposed to go
- 21 into effect as the plan for a state agency. It does not
- 22 comply by next year with doing their own plan.
- 23 As I read the model plan, I don't see any
- 24 language that says this is what this agency shall do that
- 25 would have that effect. However, in your attachment of

- 1 August '99 Waste Reduction Policies and Procedures for
- 2 State Agencies, particularly Appendix C, Sample Waste
- 3 Reduction and Procurement Policy Statements, there's some
- 4 great language in there that you could easily just say
- 5 this is what your state agency plan will be if you don't
- 6 adopt one yourself. I encourage you to come up with some
- 7 tool to address that issue of AB 75.
- 8 Last, I ask that you coordinate the
- 9 implementation of AB 75 with the SB 827 implementation,
- 10 Shares Bill that requires the use of recycled materials in
- 11 pavement applications and road construction and requires
- 12 Department of General Services to do a variety of other
- 13 recycled content procurement issues. That will require
- 14 coordination within the Waste Board between the
- 15 implementation of SB 827, buy recycling issues and AB 75.
- 16 I haven't seen that done yet in the documents I've
- 17 reviewed. I would encourage you to do that.
- Thank you very much for the opportunity.
- 19 Apologize for impacting your lunch. Thank you.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. Any questions
- 21 of Mr. Liss?
- 22 Mr. Edgar.
- MR. EDGAR: Evan Edgar, Edgar and
- 24 Associates, on behalf of the California Refuse Removal
- 25 Council. Three points today.

- 1 First, number one, CRRC supported AB 75
- 2 long ago. We'd like to see it. We're glad it's here. We
- 3 concur in the previous speaker's comments about including
- 4 projects into state facilities. Whereas defined, it
- 5 doesn't say upon implementation from the industry
- 6 perspective. We would like to see projects from Caltrans
- 7 included.
- 8 Number two, on a policy document statement
- 9 it talks about buying recycled. That couldn't be more
- 10 timely. With regards to buying recycled locally, we would
- 11 like to reference the green buildings and the landscaping.
- 12 We'd love to sell compost back to the local state
- 13 agencies.
- 14 The last comment, and something I brought
- 15 up yesterday, is about the diversion study. It has made a
- 16 lot of headway into the compliance orders and now it's
- 17 part of the state agency model. And once again, I would
- 18 like to recommend to have a peer review and Waste Board
- 19 consideration of this study before it gains more steam.
- Thank you.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. Any questions
- 22 of Mr. Edgar?
- 23 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Question for
- 24 Mr. Schiavo, because I have the same question. This thing
- 25 is under peer review right now?

- MR. SCHIAVO: Yeah. Actually, it went out.
- 2 It's been seen by about 400 or more people so far.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: When are we looking at
- 4 adopting it? Is the Board going to adopt it? Because I
- 5 have some concerns about some of this stuff.
- 6 MR. SCHIAVO: What we're looking at --
- 7 we're looking at some examples of implementation efforts
- 8 so we can actually have a practical test of it, and then
- 9 after we can work that out, we'll bring it back to the
- 10 Board.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Because there's some
- 12 verbage issues in there. If you're numbers are too low,
- 13 then do a new waste generation study because maybe you
- 14 won't have to do programs. I don't think that's verbatim.
- 15 There's areas where that's the intent and that's not our
- 16 intent, and I know it's not yours. Okay.
- Mr. Chairman.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'd like to move
- 20 adoption of Resolution 2000-34, consideration of approval
- 21 of the state agencies, and I want to make sure that the
- 22 item of including projects is included, buying recycled is
- 23 included, and that would be my motion.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones moves and

- 1 Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt Resolution
- 2 2000-34 as amended by Mr. Jones.
- 3 Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- 4 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 6 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- 9 Roberti.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 11 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye. And if you could
- 13 just hold the roll open until after lunch and
- 14 Mr. Pennington will return.
- 15 That brings us to our lunch break a little
- 16 bit late. We will reconvene at 2:15.
- 17 (Lunch recess taken)
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Welcome back, everyone,
- 19 to hopefully the final segment of our January Board
- 20 meeting. Colleagues, any ex parte communications to
- 21 report?
- 22 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: No, I do not.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: No. Jim Cool from
- 25 City of Long Beach on America Recycles, and then it will

- 1 become clear as to why it's going to be disclosed.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: Ms. Moulton-Patterson, ex
- 3 parte communications?
- 4 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: No.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: And I just had a
- 6 meet-and-greet with Mike Mohajer.
- 7 Madam Secretary, the last item that was
- 8 left open before we left for lunch, Mr. Pennington did not
- 9 have an opportunity to be recorded, so if we could open
- 10 the roll on Item Number 44.
- 11 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Member Pennington.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Item Number 46.
- 14 MR. SCHIAVO: This item will be presented
- 15 by Steve Uselton, Supervisor in our southern California
- 16 branch.
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Welcome to northern
- 18 California.
- 19 MR. USELTON: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and
- 20 Members of the Board, Item Number 46 is for your
- 21 consideration of an award of contract to the University of
- 22 California, Los Angeles to complete the required task and
- 23 the scope of work entitled "State Agency Guide and
- 24 Workshops for Measuring Waste Generation and Diversion."
- 25 The scope of work was approved on January 25th on consent

- 1 and is included in your agenda packets.
- 2 Total consideration of the award is for
- 3 \$40,000 with all work to be completed by April of 2000.
- 4 As presented in the item regarding the state agency model
- 5 Integrated Waste Management Plan, each state agency and
- 6 large state facility will now be required to develop and
- 7 adopt in consultation with the Board an Integrated Waste
- 8 Management Plan by July 19th of 2000.
- 9 In preparing this plan, each state agency
- 10 and large state facility will need to gather data and make
- 11 estimates of the diversion and disposal tonnage associated
- 12 with implementation of selected activities or programs.
- 13 The state agency guide and workshops will provide
- 14 easy-to-use methodologies and techniques for state
- 15 agencies to use in making these estimates.
- 16 Staff of the UCLA Waste Management and
- 17 Recycling Extension Program have experience and expertise
- 18 in developing similar tools and workshops in diversion
- 19 measurement for local jurisdictions and also businesses.
- 20 Staff is requesting that the Board adopt
- 21 Resolution 2000-53 and award an interagency agreement with
- 22 the University of California, Los Angeles in the amount of
- 23 \$40,000 to complete the task and the scope of work.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of staff?
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The -- I don't think I
- 3 have any problem with this, but the documents and stuff
- 4 that are generated out of UC, who owns those?
- 5 MR. USELTON: We will own those.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. We don't need
- 7 to be paying for this stuff forever. I just want to make
- 8 sure. Mr. Chairman.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you for guarding the
- 10 treasury.
- 11 (Laughter)
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, I would
- 13 like to move adoption of Resolution Number 2000-53,
- 14 consideration of award of contract to the University of
- 15 California, Los Angeles for the State Agency Guide for
- 16 Measuring Waste Generation and Diversion, contract concept
- 17 number 7.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Second.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right.
- 20 Mr. Jones moves and Mr. Pennington seconds
- 21 that we adopt Resolution 2000-53.
- 22 Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- 23 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 25 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 4 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 6 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye. Okay. Senator, we
- 8 just started that task and opened up the roll on a
- 9 previous matter for Mr. Pennington. Any ex parte
- 10 communications that need to be disclosed? Okay. All
- 11 right.
- 12 I think that completes Mr. Schiavo's work,
- 13 and then as we mentioned before --
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I hope so. He's
- 15 out the door.
- 16 (Laughter)
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Going back to that
- 18 meeting, I'm sure. As mentioned, the item concerning the
- 19 draft regulations relating to nonhazardous waste into a
- 20 regulatory tier, I'm trying to see if parties are --
- 21 Mr. Weiner is still here. He's here? He was kind enough
- 22 to -- we'll go to Item Number 36 which was draft
- 23 regulations placing certain nonhazardous waste into a
- 24 regulatory tier, and Members, if you remember, this item
- 25 was the item that was substituted in place of the AB 59

- 1 appeal as related to Safety-Kleen. Mr. Bledsoe from the
- 2 Legal Office is going to make a presentation.
- 3 MR. BLEDSOE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
- 4 Board Members. Michael Bledsoe from the Legal Office.
- 5 As you'll recall, the Safety-Kleen appeal
- 6 of Imperial County's cease and desist order had originally
- 7 been scheduled for this meeting. That appeal was pulled
- 8 from the agenda at the request of the parties.
- 9 We received on January 13 a written request
- 10 from Safety-Kleen and Imperial County Local Enforcement
- 11 Agency requesting that the Board hold that appeal in
- 12 abeyance while the Board considering placing the
- 13 particular nonhazardous wastes in question here into the
- 14 Waste Board's tiered permitting structure. The parties
- 15 recommend the registration tier and advised us that during
- 16 the Board's consideration of these regulations, if it
- 17 decides to do so, Safety-Kleen will continue not accepting
- 18 these wastes at its Westmorland facility.
- 19 Within the limits that I'll describe in a
- 20 moment here in the staff report, we think that that
- 21 concept has a lot of merit and we would recommend -- with
- 22 some modifications recommend it to the Board.
- 23 Preliminarily, I would like to advise you
- 24 that the proposal submitted by Safety-Kleen and Imperial
- 25 County does not in any way bind this Board. We're not a

- 1 party to whatever agreement they might have made. Nothing
- 2 that they have put in their letters to the Board can be
- 3 imputed to the Board, so we're not constrained by whatever
- 4 desires those parties may have here.
- 5 In a particular we call your attention, the
- 6 Board may have concern with a reference in Safety-Kleen's
- 7 January 13 letter to an administerial registration permit,
- 8 and I would suggest a better way of looking at your
- 9 registration permit is to consider it as a permit by rule
- 10 kind of a program, which was the way it was designed.
- 11 Essentially, the Waste Board delegates the responsibility
- 12 to the Local Enforcement Agency to evaluate applications
- 13 for a permit that comes in in the registration tier, and
- 14 if the facility complies with the standards and
- 15 requirements that are set out in the regulations, then the
- 16 LEA issues the permit. The Board does not have to
- 17 separately concur in those permits, so it in essence is a
- 18 permit by rule approach.
- 19 Secondly, I would point out that the fact
- 20 that Safety-Kleen and Imperial County have recommended
- 21 that the Board adopt a registration permit for these types
- 22 of waste. That recommendation does not prejudice the
- 23 Board or the staff in the Board's decision as to what
- 24 level of permit or type of permit should be required, nor
- 25 does it prejudice staff's ability to make a recommendation

- 1 to you of some different level of tier, and as I'll point
- 2 out in this discussion, staff has not fully evaluated what
- 3 the appropriate tier should be, and we'll be doing so if
- 4 the Board directs staff in that direction.
- 5 So in summary the recommendation that I
- 6 will read at the end of this presentation is that staff is
- 7 recommending to the Board that it direct staff to develop
- 8 emergency regulations and subsequently permanent
- 9 regulations to place certain nonhazardous, non-putrescible
- 10 industrial wastes that are going to be defined within the
- 11 regulations, to place them into the Waste Board's tiered
- 12 permitting structure at a level no less than the
- 13 registration tier. Those regulations would provide that
- 14 once the facility has received such a tiered permit from
- 15 the Local Enforcement Agency, the waste could be disposed
- 16 in a Class I hazardous waste facility fully regulated by
- 17 the Department of Toxic Substances Control.
- 18 You'll recall by way of background that
- 19 Safety-Kleen Westmorland, Incorporated owns and operates a
- 20 Class I hazardous waste disposal facility in Westmorland
- 21 in Imperial County. For some years prior to the cease and
- 22 desist order issued by Imperial County, that facility had
- 23 been accepting certain non-putrescible, nonhazardous waste
- 24 in addition to a full range of hazardous wastes at the
- 25 facility.

- In April of 1999, Imperial County issued a
- 2 cease and desist order directing that until it obtained a
- 3 Solid Waste Facility Permit, the facility cease accepting
- 4 nonhazardous wastes. The hazardous wastes, of course, are
- 5 covered by the facility's Class I hazardous waste facility
- 6 permit. Ultimately that cease and desist order was
- 7 appealed to the Board, originally scheduled for Board
- 8 hearing in September and subsequently postponed at the
- 9 request of the parties.
- 10 Safety-Kleen and Imperial County are now
- 11 requesting that the Board suspend its consideration of the
- 12 appeal for up to one year during which time the Board
- 13 would consider and ultimately adopt the regulations that
- 14 would place these particular wastes in the tiered system.
- 15 In the course of investigating the
- 16 situation arising -- out of which arose the Safety-Kleen
- 17 appeal, staff learned that all three Class I hazardous
- 18 waste disposal facilities in California accept these same
- 19 types of non-putrescible, nonhazardous industrial waste.
- 20 None of them have Solid Waste Facility Permits from the
- 21 Waste Board. All three, of course, have Class I facility
- 22 permits from DTSC. Not to confuse the issue, but I would
- 23 point out that Safety-Kleen owns two of the facilities.
- 24 Chemical Waste Management, Incorporated owns the third
- 25 facility. That third facility owned by Chem Waste does

- 1 have a separate cell in which it disposes municipal solid
- 2 waste. So it has a Class I facility permit for a separate
- 3 facility, a Class II and Class III permit. The wastes in
- 4 question here, though, what I'm calling non-putrescible,
- 5 nonhazardous wastes, are disposed in Chem Waste's Class I
- 6 facility. So all three of these facilities are operating
- 7 in the same manner.
- 8 The levels of the waste are pretty
- 9 substantial. At the Westmorland facility, which
- 10 Safety-Kleen owns, about 25 percent of the waste that it
- 11 accepted in 1998 fell within this nonhazardous category,
- 12 and Safety-Kleen's Buttonwillow facility takes in roughly
- 13 half of its waste at this of nonhazardous waste. The
- 14 Chemical Waste facility in Kettleman Hills I don't have
- 15 hard numbers on, but the facility operator has estimated
- 16 it's in the 5 to 10 percent range.
- 17 So obviously any decision that the Board
- 18 would make regarding Safety-Kleen, had their appeal gone
- 19 forward, would also affect these other two facilities. By
- 20 treating this matter in the form of regulations, it
- 21 provides the Board the opportunity to look somewhat more
- 22 broadly at the issue than it would have otherwise been
- 23 able to in the appeal if this had just come before the
- 24 Board as an appeal. That also provides the other
- 25 operators and interested public agencies and interested

- 1 citizens to participate in the process of defining
- 2 regulations for these facilities as well.
- 3 The fundamental concept that we're
- 4 suggesting to the Board today is that a very narrowly
- 5 defined class of nonhazardous, non-putrescible industrial
- 6 wastes could be disposed in a Class I facility upon
- 7 obtaining the appropriate tiered permit from the Local
- 8 Enforcement Agency.
- 9 By way of context, you'll recall that it is
- 10 staff's position that current law, Public Resources Code
- 11 Section 44103(b) requires that a Solid Waste Facility
- 12 Permit be obtained before any facility accepts the waste
- 13 that I've described for disposal. Safety-Kleen certainly
- 14 has a different perspective on what that statute means,
- 15 and if the appeal were going forward, they would present
- 16 their side, their analysis of why they don't believe that
- 17 statute requires a Solid Waste Facility Permit.
- By bringing this item before the Board,
- 19 we're seeking direction from you as to whether you wish to
- 20 consider placing these wastes into the regulatory tier
- 21 system, and if you decide to do so, that will satisfy the
- 22 statutory requirement that the facility obtain a Solid
- 23 Waste Facility Permit in order to accept these wastes
- 24 since of course all of the permits under our tiered system
- 25 are considered permits with the exception of the

- 1 notification permit, which is really not considered a
- 2 Solid Waste Facility Permit.
- 3 There are three key issues for the Board to
- 4 consider here. The first is the timing of the development
- 5 of the regulations. The second is what wastes are
- 6 appropriate to be included within this category. Lastly,
- 7 what tier is important -- pardon me. What tier is
- 8 appropriate.
- 9 The latter two questions, what exactly is
- 10 the waste stream to be included and at what level of
- 11 regulation, those should be evaluated by staff over the
- 12 coming month or two as the emergency regs are drafted and
- 13 then would be fully considered by the Board when you hear
- 14 this matter in the form of proposed regulations.
- As for timing, when the Board considers a
- 16 new waste stream for inclusion in the tiered system,
- 17 normally the Board first determines whether a permit is
- 18 required at all and then subsequently figures out what
- 19 tier should those wastes be placed in. In this situation,
- 20 we believe that the law already requires a Solid Waste
- 21 Facility Permit and that by proceeding with the
- 22 regulations at this point, we can more quickly get to the
- 23 position where all three facilities are permitted under
- 24 state law.
- 25 Again, normally in developing regulations

- 1 for tiered waste streams, the Board essentially follows
- 2 the first-come, first-served approach and a queue is
- 3 created where waste is waiting for regulations to be
- 4 prepared. That queue is about 18 to 24 months long right
- 5 now. There are three waste streams awaiting regulations
- 6 or final regulations -- C&D materials, organics and
- 7 semi-solids. Again, this is a special case that I think
- 8 merits pushing these nonhazardous wastes to the front of
- 9 that queue since we have three facilities that are all
- 10 operating in the same way handling these wastes, and if
- 11 the Board adopts regulations quickly, we can bring them
- 12 all into compliance with the law pretty quickly.
- 13 As for what wastes are appropriate to be
- 14 included in the regulations, I see this as the most
- 15 critical task that staff will have to develop
- 16 recommendations on and ultimately the Board will have to
- 17 decide. Non-putrescible, nonhazardous industrial wastes
- 18 is certainly not a sufficient definition, and we're going
- 19 to have to really narrow that down. That definition is
- 20 actually is what will differentiate these facilities from
- 21 any typical solid waste facility that would receive the
- 22 full range of municipal solid wastes.
- 23 The wastes originate generally from
- 24 industrial procedures, processes, and from hazardous waste
- 25 cleanups. Safety-Kleen Westmorland has provided a list of

- 1 the types of waste that they -- nonhazardous wastes that
- 2 they've received over the last three years at their
- 3 Westmorland facility so it can give you a better idea of
- 4 the kinds of wastes that we're talking about. Just
- 5 picking up the largest categories from their list, there
- 6 are about 15 different classifications of nonhazardous
- 7 waste. Soil contaminated with various hazardous materials
- 8 is the largest quantity, so these would be soils from
- 9 hazardous waste cleanup sites that are contaminated but
- 10 not to the level of being hazardous. So they'll have some
- 11 hazardous substances in them, but they're not classified
- 12 as hazardous waste. Soil contaminated with
- 13 hydrocarbons -- those primarily come from underground
- 14 storage tank cleanups -- spent filter media like filter
- 15 cakes used in industrial procedures, inorganic solids,
- 16 oil-soaked timber, absorbent materials, and then a fairly
- 17 large category of wastes that are not fully -- not
- 18 specifically identified. That would include construction
- 19 and demolition debris that would be contaminated with lead
- 20 or arsenic or other contaminants. So those are the kinds
- 21 of wastes that we're talking about.
- 22 In the course of drafting regulations and
- 23 in the Board's ultimate consideration of the regulations,
- 24 it may be appropriate to set a limit on the amount of
- 25 nonhazardous waste that any single hazardous waste

- 1 facility could take, either on a tonnage basis or as a
- 2 percentage basis of the total waste, because at some point
- 3 a facility that starts off as a hazardous waste facility,
- 4 if most of the waste that it's taking is nonhazardous, it
- 5 might be more appropriate to treat that as a solid waste
- 6 facility but under a different permit regime, and you
- 7 might want at that point even want to require a separate
- 8 cell.
- 9 The second fundamental issue that the Board
- 10 will need to work on is what is the appropriate tier that
- 11 these wastes should be placed in. As I noted above, staff
- 12 has not analyzed this situation in sufficient detail to
- 13 make a recommendation to you on that at this point, but
- 14 it's clear that some level of Waste Board and Local
- 15 Enforcement Agency oversight is needed for these wastes.
- 16 The statute requires a Solid Waste Facility Permit, and at
- 17 present large quantities of nonhazardous waste are being
- 18 disposed without what we see as the required permit. This
- 19 obviously creates an unfair situation for solid waste
- 20 facilities that accept these wastes for disposal since
- 21 they do have the required Solid Waste Facility Permit.
- 22 As noted, these wastes would be narrowly
- 23 defined to include only non-putrescible industrial types
- 24 of waste and that they would be disposed only at highly
- 25 regulated facilities. We need to recall that California's

- 1 Class I facilities are stringently regulated by DTSC, also
- 2 regulated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and
- 3 of course EPA has oversight authority there.
- 4 Based on the information that we have to
- 5 date, we have no indication that any environmental hazard
- 6 would be caused or any harm to the public health and
- 7 safety would be caused by disposing these nonhazardous
- 8 wastes in a hazardous waste facility, and we think that a
- 9 tiered permit would be sufficient to apprise local
- 10 governments as to the amounts of waste that are being
- 11 disposed, the operator's ability to handle those wastes,
- 12 and the amounts of waste that are being handled.
- 13 We've discussed this concept of tiered
- 14 permitting with the three counties in which the hazardous
- 15 waste facilities are located. Kern County and Kings
- 16 County are the other two counties, along with Imperial,
- 17 that have these facilities. Kings County and Kern County
- 18 have advised us that they don't believe any permit is
- 19 required at all. They think -- notwithstanding Section
- 20 44103, they don't believe a Solid Waste Facility Permit
- 21 should be required. Imperial County believes that a
- 22 registration permit should be required and that a
- 23 registration permit is a high enough level given the
- 24 amounts of waste and the types of waste that Safety-Kleen
- 25 is now accepting.

- 1 Under the tiered system, regulations can be
- 2 specifically designed to handle the particular waste
- 3 stream and particular management techniques that are
- 4 necessary for sufficient environmental and public health
- 5 protection. I would point out that this Board, or a
- 6 future Board, if it were to learn in the future through
- 7 new information that there were some reason to be
- 8 concerned with these wastes, statutory change or just
- 9 different policy could ultimately decide that a different
- 10 permitting system is required in the future. So once a
- 11 decision is made, placing these in a tier does not
- 12 preclude the Board from reconsidering that matter at some
- 13 point in the future.
- 14 Lastly, we did not believe that placing
- 15 these wastes into a particular tier necessarily sets a
- 16 precedent for any other kinds of waste that the Board
- 17 would be considering for tiering. This is a very special
- 18 case and a narrowly defined waste stream that's going to
- 19 be disposed in only three facilities, all of which are
- 20 highly regulated. We did not see that a Board decision
- 21 regarding these wastes would necessarily constrain the
- 22 Board in making any decision about other waste streams in
- 23 other tiering decisions it might make.
- 24 Consequently, we would recommend that the
- 25 Board approve Resolution 2000-97 directing staff to

- 1 develop emergency regulations and subsequently permanent
- 2 regulations. The regulations would provide that certain
- 3 nonhazardous, non-putrescible industrial wastes to be
- 4 defined in the course of developing the regulations would
- 5 be placed in regulatory tier at not less than the
- 6 registration tier level, such that those wastes may be
- 7 disposed in DTSC permitted Class I hazardous waste
- 8 facilities after the facility has received the required
- 9 permit.
- 10 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you, Mr. Bledsoe.
- 12 Any questions of Mr. Bledsoe?
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: How does this affect
- 14 the diversion rate of cities?
- 15 MR. BLEDSOE: There are several communities
- 16 that are wrestling with diversion questions. This would
- 17 be one more situation to be added to that list that's
- 18 currently being reviewed at staff and in the legislature.
- 19 It's not known at these three facilities whether the
- 20 wastes that are being disposed of at these three hazardous
- 21 waste facilities were included in the inventory at this
- 22 point.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Now right now, if
- 24 you would go to a Class II dump, you would have to pay a
- 25 tipping fee.

- 1 MR. BLEDSOE: That's correct.
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: What do they pay at
- 3 the Class I dump?
- 4 MR. BLEDSOE: They do not pay any state
- 5 Waste Board fee or local waste board fee on these
- 6 particular wastes, local LEA fee on these particular
- 7 wastes. They do pay on all the hazardous waste that they
- 8 dispose of, DTSC fees --
- 9 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I understand that.
- 10 When this waste comes to a Class I landfill and they see
- 11 this nonhazardous waste, is there any charge?
- 12 MR. BLEDSOE: Under current situation?
- 13 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes.
- MR. BLEDSOE: No, not a government-imposed
- 15 charge. The facility might charge whatever for the right
- 16 to dispose of that.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Well, does the
- 18 government get any money?
- MR. BLEDSOE: Not from these wastes, no,
- 20 sir.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: So if we adopted
- 22 this resolution, then in effect the jurisdiction would be
- 23 escaping -- assuming it's a jurisdiction -- would be
- 24 escaping the fees which they would have paid had they gone
- 25 through a tier --

- 1 MR. BLEDSOE: Under these regulations, if
- 2 the Board were to adopt regulations, then these wastes
- 3 would be subject to the Waste Board's \$1.34 per ton fee.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: If we adopt these
- 5 regulations.
- 6 MR. BLEDSOE: Correct. So that would level
- 7 the playing field if they were disposed of in a Class I
- 8 facility or a Class II facility. The same fees would be
- 9 paid to the Waste Board and the LEA.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: And right now if
- 11 they dispose at the Class I, they pay nothing.
- 12 MR. BLEDSOE: They pay nothing to the Waste
- 13 Board or for these wastes to DTSC, correct.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Does anybody pay --
- 15 does the landfill have any charges that they would pay?
- MR. BLEDSOE: The landfill has its own
- 17 charge for disposing of the wastes, unrelated to
- 18 government fee.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: So you don't see --
- 20 so you wouldn't see if we adopted this resolution whether
- 21 the government would receive less money for the
- 22 administration of waste programs.
- MR. BLEDSOE: No. The government would
- 24 receive more money.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Okay.

- 1 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any other questions?
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I have a couple.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: The Westmorland site,
- 5 25 percent of the waste is nonhazardous. Do you have any
- 6 tonnage to go with that?
- 7 MR. BLEDSOE: I don't have that with me, so
- 8 no. I'm sorry. I have it upstairs. I can provide it to
- 9 you.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Buttonwillow is at 50.
- MR. BLEDSOE: Correct.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And Kettleman is at 5?
- MR. BLEDSOE: Estimate 5 to 10 percent,
- 14 yes.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Because I think that
- 16 it -- the thing I'm concerned about is I know the
- 17 environmental protection is in place at a Class I landfill
- 18 to a higher extent than our Class II and III landfill
- 19 operating standards so that's not an issue, but I know
- 20 that one thing that I don't want -- I'd like to see this
- 21 thing resolved through this registration tier so that it
- 22 eliminates an old existing MOU that went through due
- 23 diligence I guess two or three times and everybody thought
- 24 it was okay -- which kind of blew me away -- but what I
- 25 don't understand is that there's two conditions in the

- 1 MOU -- one, that it be group one waste, which is hazardous
- 2 waste; and two, that it be a diminimus amount or some low
- 3 volume. 5 percent I think is reasonable. 50 percent is
- 4 not.
- 5 So at some point these become regular
- 6 landfills as more and more hazardous waste either goes out
- 7 of state or is declassified or whatever. Where it
- 8 wouldn't take advantage of California Class I sites, I
- 9 want to make sure that if the registration tier can
- 10 accommodate and through this process put some kind of a
- 11 tonnage acceptance, whether it's through a percentage or
- 12 whatever, that over a long period of time would take it
- 13 into another tier; not to increase regulatory oversight,
- 14 but to make sure that the LEA and all those jurisdictions
- 15 have the opportunity to put the conditions on that they
- 16 need.
- 17 Personally, I'm a little concerned when
- 18 Kern County and Kings -- maybe not so much Kings County
- 19 because of the 5 percent number. Maybe they can say
- 20 that's still within the intent of the MOU, but Kern County
- 21 that sees 50 percent of waste when it was clear in the
- 22 statute and it was clear in the MOU that that was not an
- 23 acceptable level and to think that they don't need
- 24 regulations keeps bringing us back to Kern County and LEA
- 25 evaluations because there's a pattern there that is

- 1 another issue. But it scares me and it scares me if we're
- 2 going into a regulatory -- if we're going to make
- 3 regulations, that's a negotiating -- that's the time to
- 4 negotiate. That's the way everybody needs to be, but I'm
- 5 worried that the negotiations somehow take away -- give
- 6 advantage to three facilities over all the other
- 7 facilities in the state just because a waste stream had
- 8 dried up.
- 9 I just want to make sure that doesn't
- 10 happen, but I think those are reasonable conditions to put
- 11 on because I think that going through this process puts
- 12 everybody in compliance and gives everybody a level of
- 13 comfort, but I don't want to see somebody get an advantage
- 14 over anybody else.
- MR. BLEDSOE: Right. Right. I would point
- 16 out that the Buttonwillow facility, which has the 50
- 17 percent nonhazardous waste, is receiving a large quantity
- 18 of waste from the Avila Beach cleanup right now. Of that
- 19 50 percent, a significant portion would be from that
- 20 hopefully one-time event.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: One-time event. Okay.
- 22 That's wonderful.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any other questions of
- 24 Mr. Bledsoe before we take the public comments?
- 25 Mr. Gerald Quick, I believe, if so you desire.

- 1 MR. QUICK: Chairman Eaton and Members of
- 2 the Board, my name is Gerald Quick. I'm the contact
- 3 person for the LEA in Imperial County, and I wish to
- 4 support staff's recommendation that your Board order them
- 5 to develop emergency regulations to handle the waste that
- 6 you've heard so much about.
- 7 Frankly, that's all I need to say. Thank
- 8 you.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you very much,
- 10 Mr. Quick. It's been a long process.
- Mr. Peter Weiner. Thank you, Mr. Weiner,
- 12 for your courtesy this morning and allowing us to complete
- 13 some of the other business.
- 14 MR. WEINER: Thank you very much, Chairman
- 15 Eaton. Chairman Eaton and Members of the Board, I'm Peter
- 16 Weiner. I'm with the law firm of Paul, Hastings, Jenofski
- 17 and Walker, and I represent Safety-Kleen in this
- 18 proceeding.
- 19 We're very pleased to be here today and
- 20 we're very pleased to be able to come to a conclusion with
- 21 the County of Imperial that allows this process to go
- 22 forward in a constructive manner that looks forward rather
- 23 than backward. We're very hopeful that we can proceed in
- 24 that fashion and we have not, of course, dismissed the
- 25 appeal. It's suspended so that all the parties have the

- 1 right to come back to the Board if they perceive that
- 2 there's an issue.
- Because, as Mr. Bledsoe so ably stated, it
- 4 is clear we disagree with Board staff on several issues.
- 5 I think it is encumbent upon me to mention a couple of
- 6 those issues in that the record of this proceeding does
- 7 have to do with what staff does going forward.
- 8 We absolutely concur with staff that
- 9 nothing that Safety-Kleen and the County said in their
- 10 letter to you is binding upon the Board or staff. In
- 11 particular, there's certainly nothing binding upon you to
- 12 require that a registration tier be adopted rather than
- 13 another tier. I should say, however, on behalf of
- 14 Safety-Kleen, that from our point of view this is a
- 15 fragile settlement that we have reached.
- We believe, along with staff and as
- 17 Mr. Jones expressed, that environmental protection has
- 18 been amply served in this matter by DTSC regulation, and
- 19 as you know, the other two counties believe that no permit
- 20 should be required at all. Therefore, I would point out
- 21 that where staff says that if the Board determined that
- 22 adequate protection is not achieved by a tiered permit, a
- 23 full permit would be required. That's staff's position,
- 24 not ours. We would, of course, reinstate our appeal.
- We agree that the issues have to do, in

- 1 creating a registration tier, with timing and which wastes
- 2 in which tier, and we are certainly in congruence or we
- 3 certainly defer to the Board and to staff as to the timing
- 4 of development of these regulations. We don't mean to
- 5 jump over anybody else who's in line, but that's the Board
- 6 determination and we certainly are fine with that.
- We are concerned about staff's position
- 8 that a, quote, very narrowly defined class, unquote, of
- 9 non-putrescible, nonhazardous industrial waste would be
- 10 put into this tier. I only say that because it is true
- 11 that we gave staff a list of 15 categories that we accept
- 12 at Westmorland. If staff believes those 15 categories are
- 13 a very narrowly defined class, then we're in agreement.
- 14 But you know what adjectives are. They're different
- 15 things to different people.
- 16 I think that we believe the status quo of
- 17 what these facilities accept is about right, but I want to
- 18 point out that when we say non-putrescible, nonhazardous
- 19 industrial wastes, that is what distinguishes these
- 20 facilities from ordinary MSW facilities because we don't
- 21 take trash, we don't take putrescible waste, we don't
- 22 create -- take waste as staff said in the report. We
- 23 don't create vector problems or gas problems or what have
- 24 you. So when I see in the staff report that sewage sludge
- 25 is likely to be excluded or some other category that is

- 1 actually now has been taken historically, deactivated
- 2 sewage sludge, and that's an issue with the County and we
- 3 understand that. We're just concerned that this not be
- 4 predetermined.
- 5 We ask that staff be given the opportunity
- 6 to look at this, but that we all be given the opportunity
- 7 rather than have something be prejudged. All of the
- 8 wastes that we take now or have taken, and you take at
- 9 Buttonwillow and I believe Chem Waste takes, are within
- 10 the gambit of that old MOU. I want to clarify that. We
- 11 all relied -- both facilities relied on that MOU for the
- 12 last 20 years, and we certainly want to be clear that
- 13 we're looking forward and not backward as if there were
- 14 some problem, but that MOU did state that group one wastes
- 15 were involved.
- 16 The only difference is that from our
- 17 reading of what group one wastes were, it's a Water Board
- 18 term not a Waste Board or a DTSC-type term. It's a Water
- 19 Board term. Group one wastes included what are now called
- 20 designated wastes, which are nonhazardous but generally
- 21 non-putrescible and industrial wastes. So the
- 22 contaminated soils that we take from cleanups, those are
- 23 from, as far as we know, group one wastes. So we would
- 24 certainly thing that a diminimus amount of non-group one
- 25 wastes would be correct, but what we're taking now are

- 1 group one wastes.
- 2 It's just nomenclature, and I understand
- 3 that. We don't think that there is any, any level playing
- 4 field problem involved. We are cognizant of the fee
- 5 implications going forward of this resolution and we will
- 6 want to address them in some way during the debate and
- 7 during those negotiations, but this is not a make or break
- 8 issue for us, but we would say, first of all, no one that
- 9 we know -- and I'm addressing Senator Roberti's comments
- 10 here.
- No one that sends us waste for the last
- 12 seven or eight years where we've tracked it has had a
- 13 waste that had previously been part of the baseline.
- 14 These are all wastes that have generally gone to Class I
- 15 facilities because no one else would take them and people
- 16 were scared to send them some other place. Number two,
- 17 the cost of bringing it to us is sufficient -- believe me.
- 18 It's not the \$1.34 that governs whether they come to us or
- 19 not. The costs are much higher. In Imperial County, just
- 20 for the record, we do pay a 10 percent gross receipts tax
- 21 on the nonhazardous. So the County is getting money or
- 22 has historically gotten money from those nonhazardous
- 23 wastes.
- 24 So with regard to the quantity issue and
- 25 the tier issue, we certainly have a view with regard to

- 1 the tier which is to say that we don't think that the
- 2 additional oversight of operations included in the
- 3 standardized permit tier is appropriate. We're willing to
- 4 discuss that going forward if this resolution is adopted
- 5 and we certainly expect to discuss quantity issues and
- 6 definitional issues of what's included, but we do come
- 7 back to the bedrock issue that environmental protection is
- 8 being served now and we believe, and have been convinced
- 9 by this Board and this staff, that there is a purpose to
- 10 be served in having a reporting relationship, the kind
- 11 that's involved in a registration tier, to this Board,
- 12 that this Board has a role in looking at what waste goes
- 13 where and we fully intend to participate in this process.
- 14 So we appreciate very much the staff's
- 15 recommendation of Resolution 2000-97. We're in agreement
- 16 with it. I only wanted to state our caveats for the
- 17 record because we certainly have an interest in this
- 18 proceeding.
- 19 Thank you very much.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. Any questions
- 21 of Mr. Weiner? Thank you. Chuck White, Waste Management.
- MR. WHITE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
- 23 Members of the Board. Chuck White with Waste Management.
- 24 Chemical Waste Management is a wholly-owned subsidiary of
- 25 Waste Management and is the owner of the Kettleman Hills

- 1 facility.
- We've been somewhat absent, I guess, from
- 3 many of the discussions that have gone on with
- 4 Safety-Kleen, although we have been watching it with
- 5 interest, and we are looking forward to this issue being
- 6 resolved and moving forward. Like Mr. Weiner said, we
- 7 were interested in looking at this in a go-forward
- 8 approach.
- 9 The Kettleman Hills facility has received
- 10 mostly hazardous waste since it first started operating in
- 11 1979, although occasionally we have a customer approach us
- 12 that wishes to have their waste, maybe solid and
- 13 nonhazardous industrial waste, managed in a Class I cell.
- 14 It's generally for one or two reasons.
- One, they like the added security of a
- 16 Class I cell, even though it may cost a little more in
- 17 putting into a double-lined facility and various
- 18 acceptance procedures that the waste be subject to. Some
- 19 customers prefer that added level of security.
- 20 An example would be some years ago we
- 21 received some old disk drives that a computer manufacturer
- 22 did not want to have either recycled or salvaged or
- 23 scavenged or put into a less secure municipal landfill.
- 24 They chose to pay the extra price to put it into a Class I
- 25 facility because they didn't want to have anybody looking

- 1 at their disk drives. That's one example.
- 2 Another example would be the liability
- 3 issue. There's a number of nonhazardous wastes out there
- 4 that look like a hazardous waste. They exceed hazardous
- 5 waste regulatory levels, but they're eligible for an
- 6 exemption from being regulated as a hazardous waste.
- 7 Those generators would like to see those kinds of wastes
- 8 managed in a Class I facility because at some point in
- 9 time in the future that exemption might go away and they
- 10 would prefer to have that waste already disposed of in a
- 11 safe Class I facility rather than out elsewhere.
- 12 Those are typically the two kinds of cases
- 13 that we would be receiving, these types of nonhazardous
- 14 industrial waste in a Class I cell. We are a heavily
- 15 regulated facility at Kettleman Hills. It is an expensive
- 16 facility to run and maintain and maintain that level of
- 17 compliance. So as Mr. Weiner indicated, we don't view of
- 18 it being a level playing field issue. It's generally more
- 19 expensive to send your waste to a Class I facility because
- 20 of the reasons I mentioned.
- 21 The facility which started in 1979 is also
- 22 aware of the law that was passed in 1979. That basically
- 23 is the law that's in the Health and Safety Code section
- 24 that Mr. Bledsoe mentioned, but that same year there was
- 25 this MOU passed by the agencies after the effective date

- 1 of that legislation. And the facility, in good faith, has
- 2 always looked upon that MOU as being clarifying of the
- 3 legislation that had already gone into effect. That is,
- 4 the agencies got together and made a determination that
- 5 they believe the best way to regulate this kind of
- 6 facility was through a full-blown hazardous waste facility
- 7 permit and that other types of permits are not necessary.
- 8 To our knowledge, that 1979 MOU has never
- 9 been amended or rescinded by the executing agencies or
- 10 their successors, which would include this Board. We have
- 11 recognized that there is a growing need for -- in the
- 12 south central valley for industrial waste disposal. We
- 13 actually have converted a Class I cell that Mr. Bledsoe
- 14 mentioned to a Class II cell. It is fully permitted at
- 15 this Board, and for the most part industrial waste and
- 16 municipal solid waste would be disposed of in that Class
- 17 II, although we will also continue to operate the Class I
- 18 hazardous waste cell and we would like to be able to
- 19 provide that cell to customers who desire to have their
- 20 nonhazardous industrial waste managed in that more secure
- 21 and isolated configuration.
- 22 We fully support the Board going ahead with
- 23 the registration permit developing regulations. We
- 24 believe that a registration tier permit is probably the
- 25 appropriate level of regulation. We would encourage you

- 1 to provide direction to the staff to move in that
- 2 direction, if you so desire. We would like to work with
- 3 the staff as these emergency regulations are developed.
- 4 The one issue that is a bit of concern, and
- 5 as was mentioned by Mr. Weiner as well, is this narrowly
- 6 defined category of industrial, non-putrescible solid
- 7 waste, and the question would be how do you ensure that
- 8 you've captured all of the waste in a list that would be
- 9 suitable for bringing to that facility.
- 10 We would be concerned that we would
- 11 inadvertently leave something off that list and then it
- 12 would pop up as a desire of a customer to take it and to
- 13 manage it, and if it's not on that list specifically we
- 14 wouldn't be able to take it. We would have to go back and
- 15 do an amendment to either the regulations or to the
- 16 registration permit. An example is disk drives, for
- 17 example, that I mentioned earlier. What if disk drives
- 18 are not on that list and some customer wants to see their
- 19 highly sensitive, technical waste put into that Class I
- 20 facility and disk drives aren't specifically on that list.
- 21 So we don't object to a reasonably defined
- 22 list of wastes. We just want to make sure that it is
- 23 sufficiently to be able to provide some flexibility in
- 24 bringing these kinds of nonhazardous industrial waste into
- 25 a secure facility as a customer may desire.

- 1 But anyway, the bottom line is we would
- 2 like to work with you. We would like to see the
- 3 regulation move forward, and we believe a registration
- 4 tier would be a suitable tier for this kind of operation,
- 5 if so you desire.
- 6 Thank you.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you. Any questions
- 8 of Mr. White?
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Just one, and I don't
- 12 care if Chuck answers this or Mr. Weiner, but I think the
- 13 registration tier is probably appropriate and gets you
- 14 guys where you want to go, but our registration tiers
- 15 typically don't allow LEAs to put on conditions. One of
- 16 the conditions that is pretty much consistent through most
- 17 permits is that the LEA can get a report, and whatever
- 18 they think the proper incremental time would be -- once a
- 19 quarter, once every six months, once every year -- of the
- 20 types of delivery vehicles, the number of trips, the
- 21 material that came in. Rather than -- to define the waste
- 22 under a registration tier and exclude something doesn't
- 23 serve your purpose.
- 24 A full Solid Waste Facility Permit
- 25 obviously may be more -- may be a redundant environmental

- 1 protection, but the LEA needs to be able to go into a
- 2 facility and say okay, what kind of trips do we have, what
- 3 kind of material is coming in, whatever the LEA thinks is
- 4 appropriate to make sure -- not from an environmental
- 5 protection side but from the CEQA and the other issues
- 6 that the LEA has to deal with.
- 7 Under the registration tier, the ones that
- 8 have gone forward to date may not include those types of
- 9 things. You guys, is that a condition that you think is
- 10 important to giving LEAs and the Board the type of
- 11 information they need and would be consistent with
- 12 inclusion into a registration tier?
- 13 MR. WHITE: We would not have any concern
- 14 about reporting the kinds of waste we're bringing in. In
- 15 fact, that's exactly the kind of relationship we have
- 16 right now. There isn't anything that we hide from Kings
- 17 County. They know whatever waste, hazardous waste --
- 18 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And I'm not saying
- 19 hiding, Chuck. You know that.
- 20 (Laughter)
- 21 MR. WHITE: We're fully open. There's no
- 22 problem there at all. It's basically -- all it would be
- 23 would be a continuation and a verification of our existing
- 24 procedures.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Right. Trips and --

- MR. WHITE: So no, we wouldn't have any
- 2 problem.
- 3 MR. WEINER: If I could just answer for
- 4 Safety-Kleen. I don't think we have any concern about
- 5 reporting conditions. Operating conditions are a little
- 6 different, and that's the kind of line we draw. But we're
- 7 fully in concurrence that LEAs may need reports of various
- 8 sorts and we don't mind that in the registration tier.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Okay. I'm trying to
- 10 keep the integrity of the registration tier, which is
- 11 flexible to a point, but I want to assure that Mr. Quick
- 12 and others have what they think they need so that you can
- 13 take disks in at that facility and not be precluded but
- 14 still give him the opportunity to do his job. I'm
- 15 wondering does that make sense, Mr. Quick, or is that
- 16 overkill? You're an LEA.
- 17 MR. QUICK: It might be overkill when it's
- 18 all over with, but not at the present time.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's fair. If it's
- 20 too much, we could fix it.
- 21 MR. WEINER: But we can't tell him where
- 22 the disk drives are.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: There you go.
- 24 (Laughter)
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: With that answer, I can

- 1 see why the appeal came forward.
- 2 (Laughter)
- MR. WHITE: One more comment. Mr. Jones, I
- 4 think you were asking about the quantity of waste, and I'm
- 5 not sure why you didn't get a more specific answer but
- 6 maybe because it's difficult to get a more specific answer
- 7 in the sense that the amount of tonnage of nonhazardous
- 8 waste in going to a Class I cell at Kettleman is very
- 9 tremendously -- it's really an event-based type of
- 10 business. There isn't any ongoing waste stream going into
- 11 this. It's typically been about 5 to 10 percent of the
- 12 total tonnage.
- 13 The tonnage at Kettleman, hazardous waste
- 14 tonnage, has ranged anywhere from about 150,000 tons a
- 15 year to 600,000 tons a year total waste, so if you can
- 16 imagine 10 percent of that. The only exception to that
- 17 was this last year when there was this mining waste. It
- 18 was brought into the facility. Actually, it fails the
- 19 hazardous waste criteria, but it is exempt through a bevel
- 20 amendment and so there was a very large quantity of that
- 21 brought in and so I think the tonnage of that this past
- 22 year was about 50,000 tons. But it's kind of a unique
- 23 category.
- 24 So I'm a little concerned about putting any
- 25 hard and fast tonnage limits because of the fluctuating

- 1 nature, and we would be certainly happy with reporting and
- 2 telling jurisdictions, the LEA, the Board what the amount
- 3 is, but putting a cap on that would somehow constrain the
- 4 operations for something like a bevel exempt but otherwise
- 5 looks like a hazardous waste, would that be really serving
- 6 the public interest to preclude that from the facility
- 7 because it might have a cap. I'm just worried about fully
- 8 anticipating the configurations of an event-based
- 9 business, which really is what we're talking about.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I wasn't trying to put
- 11 a cap. What I was trying to do was get a sense of how,
- 12 especially with the idea that two LEAs didn't think there
- 13 was an issue and one did, and when you look at the
- 14 tonnages and you look at the statute and the MOU, I worry
- 15 about it from the standpoint of equal playing. You know
- 16 my thing has always been keep it a level playing field.
- 17 When the RSU came forward and a lot of that
- 18 material was going to leave your facilities and go
- 19 somewhere else, that didn't make any sense either. If you
- 20 remember, I wanted -- we all tried to make sure it was
- 21 fair and equitable. So it may not be a tonnage cap, it
- 22 may not be any of those things, but at some point if it is
- 23 -- you know, when we see a -- when I see a thing that says
- 24 "contaminated C&D", define "contaminated" because that's
- 25 the problem, and it's with those kinds of terms that

- 1 materials that could go to two or three all of a sudden
- 2 have to go to one is where I have a real problem because
- 3 of the definition. You know regulations are part of
- 4 negotiations, but, you know, you guys are awfully good
- 5 negotiators. I want to make sure it stays fair.
- 6 (Laughter)
- 7 MR. WHITE: And we appreciate the
- 8 opportunity to negotiate with you.
- 9 Thank you.
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: The final speaker on this
- 11 item is Evan Edgar, CRRC.
- 12 MR. EDGAR: Good afternoon, Chairman and
- 13 Board Members. My name is Evan Edgar, Edgar and
- 14 Associates, on behalf of the California Refuse Removal
- 15 Council's landfills group. We still have landfills at
- 16 CRRC.
- 17 I'd like to go on a go-forward approach.
- 18 Go-forward, Inc. would have been here today, but they
- 19 couldn't make it. They are part of the CRRC landfill
- 20 group as well.
- 21 I'm here to support staff recommendations
- 22 to place this waste into a registration solid waste permit
- 23 or above. As you know, the registration Solid Waste
- 24 Facility Permit typically does have caps. For composting,
- 25 it's 10,000 cubic yards. So when you do talk about

- 1 registration of Solid Waste Facilities Permits, I believe
- 2 there's some level of cap that could be placed.
- 3 What I have a problem with is some of the
- 4 definitions here as well. I believe that the disposal of
- 5 nonhazardous, non-designated waste that has the potential
- 6 to be recycled and should be recycled and is being
- 7 disposed of in a Class I, Class II, Class III, it should
- 8 count as disposal. And by default here, it could be
- 9 counted as diversion in today's world. So some of this
- 10 non-designated, nonhazardous contaminated C&D or some of
- 11 this treatable, contaminated soils could be going to Class
- 12 I facilities as disposal and it's diversion by default.
- 13 So I think the staff is on the right track
- 14 here by putting in under some type of Solid Waste Facility
- 15 Permit so it counts as disposal, it should be disposal,
- 16 and it does level the playing field. It does create the
- 17 opportunity for the people I represent to recycle
- 18 nonhazardous C&D and contaminated soils, and should
- 19 disposal still occur, then it counts as disposal, it pays
- 20 a fee, it has a permit. That is leveling the playing
- 21 field and creating the recycling opportunities that my
- 22 businesses I represent need to have.
- Thank you.
- 24 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions of
- 25 Mr. Edgar? Thank you, Mr. Edgar.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I just wanted to
- 4 say one thing, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to support Item
- 5 36, Resolution 2000-97. However, there's one issue that
- 6 concerns me. The companies operating these three Class I
- 7 facilities in the state, say they have been operating and
- 8 relying on the terms of a 1997 memorandum of understanding
- 9 between the precursors to the Board, the Water Board and
- 10 Toxics, and I'm not aware of any action taken by any of
- 11 these agencies or successor agencies to clarify, modify or
- 12 terminate this understanding. I would like it clearly
- 13 stated that we are undertaking a different direction in
- 14 regulations of these wastes and that this action is
- 15 neutral to the validity of the past regulations or under
- 16 the MOU so that these people have been relying on this,
- 17 and I think we need to at least recognize that they have
- 18 been relying on it.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: I normally wouldn't have a
- 20 problem. I think it brings in extraneous issues that
- 21 really don't -- that issue is not before us. I have had
- 22 the same conversations with those gentlemen with the MOU.
- 23 I don't think the Board should really even comment on that
- 24 because we have not taken any kind of enforcement action,
- 25 we have not taken any kind of action. I think it's

- 1 overreaching, quite frankly, to bring it into this
- 2 discussion because this discussion really involves just us
- 3 to proceed forward.
- We have never, ever indicated that the MOU
- 5 was valid. There's a legitimate legal dispute about that
- 6 MOU, and that was one of the issues raised. I think if
- 7 we're just silent, things continue in the status quo, and
- 8 thus far I think the status quo has been sufficient, if
- 9 I'm not mistaken, but I'll let those gentlemen speak on
- 10 it.
- I just think for that, the very issues that
- 12 they raised, legal issues with regard to the MOU and the
- 13 contentions of our own staff, I think to make that
- 14 statement actually is contrary to where we want to move.
- 15 I think the resolution is silent on that and that that's
- 16 sufficient. Now, the regulations will take care of all of
- 17 that, I believe, and at least that was my indication with
- 18 the conversations I had. So let's start from a clean
- 19 slate. Let's not start from one where someone seems to
- 20 have an edge, not only from a legal standpoint but from a
- 21 negotiation standpoint, should we get there.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I don't have any
- 23 problem starting from a clean slate, I just want to be
- 24 sure that we don't go back to it.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think that will be

- 1 determined by the regulations. The regulations will
- 2 determine whether or not any of the past practices are
- 3 there. I don't think we've taken any enforcement action
- 4 that I'm aware of, have we, against any of these
- 5 facilities? But I think the resolution speaks for itself
- 6 and anything else is completely outside the bounds.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 8 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I would like to move
- 10 adoption of Resolution Number 2000-97, consideration of
- 11 directing staff to draft emergency -- Mr. Chairman.
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Yes.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I want to ask a
- 14 question. Are we talking draft emergency regulations?
- 15 Okay -- draft emergency regulations placing certain
- 16 nonhazardous wastes into the regulatory tier.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Second.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones moves and
- 19 Mr. Pennington seconds --
- 20 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: I think I heard two
- 22 seconds. I think my ears are going bad.
- 23 Mr. Jones moves and Mr. Pennington seconds
- 24 that we adopt Resolution 2000-97.
- 25 Madam Secretary, would you please call the

- 1 roll.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: And add the word
- 3 "emergency".
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: And add the word
- 5 "emergency" to the title of the resolution.
- 6 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 8 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 10 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 12 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 14 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye. And I would just
- 16 like to thank the staff and also the County of Imperial,
- 17 as well as Mr. Weiner's client, for trying to come to this
- 18 resolution and hopefully we'll be able to resolve it in a
- 19 quick fashion and to the satisfaction of all the parties,
- 20 including those who have other facilities. Thank you.
- 21 Item Number 48.
- 22 MR. FRITH: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman
- 23 and Members of the Board. John Frith of the Public
- 24 Affairs Office, and it's our privilege to come before you
- 25 today with the Board's first public relations contract in

- 1 probably about eight years. We're here to present Item
- 2 47.
- 3 I will provide you with an overview of the
- 4 broader publication effort along with possible avenues
- 5 upon which you may wish to proceed. I want to stress that
- 6 what we're asking for today is your input and your
- 7 direction in what areas to focus on as far as this effort.
- 8 Chris Peck will outline what the actual contract would
- 9 provide and Roni Java is here to answer any questions you
- 10 may have about how the Board's sponsorship program may
- 11 dovetail with this effort.
- 12 Our hope today is that you'll approve a
- 13 scope of work in order to get the RFP process rolling. We
- 14 need to select a recommended proposal and bring an actual
- 15 contract back to the Board by June at the latest in order
- 16 to encumber the funds this fiscal year. And this is the
- 17 first time I've used Power Point, so bear with me, please.
- 18 First, the background. The \$750,000
- 19 contract concept was approved by the Board in San Luis
- 20 Obispo in October. The PR contract would promote
- 21 Board-wide efforts. We are here to present some options
- 22 and ideas to kind of start the discussion, if you will,
- 23 amongst the Board on directions to proceed in and, as I
- 24 say, to seek the Board's discussion, deliberation and
- 25 direction.

- Why do we need to do anything? Well, first
- 2 of all, of course, it is the year 2000. It is the year
- 3 that the AB 939 mandate goes into effect for the 50
- 4 percent reduction. According to the AB 939 report you
- 5 discussed yesterday, a majority of local jurisdictions are
- 6 expected to file for SB 1066. Clearly there is a lack of
- 7 knowledge in some segments of the population in
- 8 California, and anything we could do to increase that
- 9 knowledge and awareness would be beneficial. And then
- 10 finally one issue that was very made very clear as part of
- 11 the 21st century initiative effort last winter was that
- 12 public local governments do strongly support the idea of a
- 13 statewide public education effort.
- 14 So possible outcomes, any number of
- 15 possible outcomes. These are just a few. One would be to
- 16 motivate the public to recommit to waste diversion while
- 17 educating them about the accomplishments so far, the
- 18 importance of recycling, how and what to buy recycled.
- 19 For example, on a buy recycle campaign, we could work to
- 20 increase support for products made from recycled materials
- 21 and its recycle campaign, for example, an idea that came
- 22 to me about four cups of coffee yesterday.
- 23 We could work on increasing business
- 24 recycling. Our research and conversations with local
- 25 officials indicates that is a key obstacle to getting to

- l 50 percent for many local jurisdictions. We could ensure
- 2 that the administration and the legislature are fully
- 3 aware of state and local efforts and accomplishments in a
- 4 cooperative effort with the Division of Planning and Local
- 5 Assistance and, of course, Board offices. And finally, to
- 6 ensure that there is very strong two-way communication
- 7 between the Board and local officials on key 939 related
- 8 issues this year.
- 9 How do we get there? Well, we need a
- 10 theme. Ideally that would be part of the PR contractor's
- 11 responsibility, but as we'll get to in a few moments, that
- 12 process probably won't get underway after the contract is
- 13 actually awarded until the summer or perhaps as long as
- 14 the early fall, and we're concerned about waiting until
- 15 that length of time to move forward. So we are including
- 16 some staff generated themes and, believe me, other
- 17 suggestions are welcome. I'll run a few of them by you
- 18 here.
- 19 "Make every day earth day," it's old, but
- 20 effective. "Don't let California go to waste", "Waste
- 21 not, California". Senator Roberti had asked us
- 22 specifically that we try to come up with some ideas that
- 23 didn't have the word "recycle" because of the fact that so
- 24 many of the Board's efforts do transcend mere recycling,
- 25 but we still input some, anyway. "Recycle: Once is never

- 1 enough", "It's better the second time around, buy
- 2 recycle", "A great idea for a whole new millenium", "Once
- 3 is not enough", "California wants you", much as the
- 4 Governor said, "To recycle", and "Come on, California. Do
- 5 it again", and "When you buy recycle, it's twice as nice".
- 6 Like I say, suggestions are welcome.
- What we are envisioning is a multi-pronged
- 8 effort. Regardless of the themes and goals you direct us
- 9 to pursue, we recognize that there's a wide variety of
- 10 activities that we can do in-house as well as a paid PR
- 11 contract. In-house, of course, we would focus on the
- 12 issues you direct us to pursue. We would continue efforts
- 13 in other key priority areas such as grasscycling and
- 14 composting, the buy recycle effort, state responsibility,
- 15 sustainability, tires, and education but would focus on
- 16 the main priorities.
- 17 How we would go about that? A variety of
- 18 ways including Board Member participation in editorial
- 19 boards and public affairs shows interviews, press
- 20 releases, events, the usual things there, as well as our
- 21 California Heartland contract that the Board recently
- 22 awarded. Increased outreach to state local officials
- 23 would also be an in-house responsibility.
- 24 And then finally, a paid PR and advertising
- 25 campaign to more fully publicize the Board's priorities.

- 1 That would go to the general public through such means as
- 2 earned media, production of collateral material, PSAs and
- 3 the like. Then targeted audiences, if you select any,
- 4 such as the business community, apartment owners and
- 5 residents, the buy recycle message and so forth.
- 6 Anyway, Chris Peck is now here to walk you
- 7 through the contract proposal per se.
- 8 MR. PECK: Thank you, John. Good
- 9 afternoon, Board Members.
- 10 What I wanted to do is take a minute to
- 11 walk quickly through the draft scope of work that's in the
- 12 packet. Actually you, I believe, should have a copy of
- 13 the scope of work which would be attachment one revised.
- 14 It looks like this.
- We have left the top of it where we talk
- 16 about the desired outcomes open. John has suggested some
- 17 possible outcomes. We are going to be seeking direction
- 18 from you on what you would really like to see coming out
- 19 of the expenditure of this contract money with respect to
- 20 outcomes and target audiences.
- 21 For the sake of discussion, just to recap,
- 22 the Board approved in October \$750,000 for this contract
- 23 concept. \$600,000 of this basically is for the public
- 24 awareness campaign, and \$150,000 is for the sponsorship.
- 25 So when we talk about all the tasks except for the last

- 1 one, we're talking about a budget right now of \$600,000.
- 2 Task one is earned media, news releases at
- 3 events, opinion and editorial coverage, radio and
- 4 television talk show appearances, public service
- 5 announcements, which we've lumped with earned media
- 6 because we're not paying for it. We're talking about paid
- 7 advertising separately as another task and other
- 8 activities that would be recommended by the contractor.
- 9 Within the earned media -- thank you, John
- 10 -- within earned media activities, as well as the outreach
- 11 efforts, we would be anticipating that Board Members and
- 12 staff and key opinion leaders from local government,
- 13 business and non-profit organizations would be involved in
- 14 those kinds of activities with respect to making
- 15 appearances and speeches.
- 16 The average programs would be appropriate
- 17 to reach the target audience as recommended by the
- 18 contractor. That is we would conduct outreach activities
- 19 depending upon the type of preferred outcome of the Board
- 20 and target audience. I have in mind an example with
- 21 respect to outreach versus paid advertising. For example,
- 22 if we wanted to do a general education program focusing
- 23 on, let's say, buy recycle, then paid advertising would
- 24 likely be an appropriate component of a campaign trying to
- 25 accomplish that end. If, on the other hand, we were

- 1 focusing on business recycling programs and trying to make
- 2 avenues to increases in business recycling, we probably
- 3 would be relying more on outreach, just using pure
- 4 contact, than we would on paid advertising. So without
- 5 knowing where the Board wants to go yet or what the
- 6 specific target audiences are, it's difficult to say how
- 7 those tasks and budget would break out.
- 8 As I said, paid advertising under task
- 9 three would be appropriate depending upon the desired
- 10 outcomes and target audiences. If we decide to do paid
- 11 advertising, it's staff's opinion that there are budget
- 12 implications. That is that if we want to spend money on
- 13 radio advertising, we need to think carefully about what
- 14 else we want to accomplish with the money because we could
- 15 spend \$400,000 in a month of radio advertising just in the
- 16 four major markets.
- 17 Task four, partnerships. Partnerships
- 18 would be developed under the contract by the contractor
- 19 with what we would term warm leads from the Board and
- 20 staff, both in local government and the private sector.
- 21 This would allow us to leverage the campaign budget for
- 22 both the advertising as well as outreach activities.
- 23 Task five, program measurement, is very
- 24 important. The statute specifically requires the Board to
- 25 do -- to benchmark and track the effectiveness of its

- 1 public awareness campaign expenditures using appropriate
- 2 research. As currently drafted, we left the term -- the
- 3 specific word "research" out because depending on how much
- 4 money is available, we may not have the opportunity to do
- 5 in-depth research, but there would be other benchmarks
- 6 that would be possible to be taken.
- 7 Lastly, task six, the public education
- 8 sponsorships. This is the \$150,000 which was allocated by
- 9 the Board. This would be different from the way that the
- 10 Board has done sponsorships in years past in that our
- 11 public relations agency would essentially be the general
- 12 contractor and the sponsorship recipients would be
- 13 subcontracted to the Board. The general contractor would
- 14 act to develop, with input from the Board, criteria for
- 15 screening applications. They would solicit proposals,
- 16 review and evaluate proposals, score them, and bring
- 17 funding recommendations to the Board, then the Board would
- 18 have the ability to approve or disapprove the
- 19 subcontractors.
- We've laid out, based upon anticipated
- 21 approval of the scope of work today, a time line that
- 22 would get us to an award of the contract at the May
- 23 meeting. There is some flexibility in here. We have
- 24 quite a good period of time for proposal evaluation,
- 25 interviews and site visits. That could be compacted

- 1 somewhat, and we do anticipate we could be completing an
- 2 evaluation process up to shortly before the Board meeting.
- 3 So it's possible we could rollover to a June Board date,
- 4 but a May Board date would be much more comfortable
- 5 because of year-end closure and that kind of stuff and
- 6 would give us time to actually encumber the money through
- 7 a contract.
- 8 What we're asking for the Board to do today
- 9 is to give us direction on the scope of work; that is,
- 10 those key outcomes and target audiences that the Board
- 11 believes are the most important. We want you to think
- 12 about and give us some direction on your sense of the
- 13 importance of paid advertising versus public relations
- 14 activities.
- 15 If you do want to do paid advertising,
- 16 we're asking that you think about how much money you want
- 17 to put into paid advertising and we can give you some
- 18 ideas if you have questions about certain kinds of
- 19 advertising costs, but we would need to identify where
- 20 that money would come from, whether it would be later this
- 21 year to a year-end sweep or through contract funding from
- 22 next year. The important point there is if we wanted to
- 23 include money for advertising and wanted to put more money
- 24 in, we need to include that as not to exceed in the RFP
- 25 and in the contract so that we don't have to go back and

- 1 issue a new contract, to go through this process again to
- 2 expend those monies.
- 3 So again, we're seeking your discussion and
- 4 deliberation and direction on these issues. Thank you and
- 5 we'll be happy to answer questions.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Mr. Chairman.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Senator Roberti.
- 8 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Just very briefly.
- 9 Since we have limited funds, my own recommendation would
- 10 be -- and parenthetically, none of us know absolutely what
- 11 will work -- my own recommendation would be that we sort
- 12 of vary our focus to one or two items and stress those
- 13 things. I don't have any strong feelings what they would
- 14 be, but I wouldn't want to publish the whole work of the
- 15 Board because it's going to get kind of lost. So I would
- 16 stress one and two items to sort of grab the public and
- 17 hopefully let the world know that we do more than count
- 18 Q-tips.
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: I've heard that.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Yes. We do that,
- 21 too.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: So -- I didn't know if you
- 24 were finished.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: That's it. That's

- 1 fine.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I just saw him go
- 3 back. That's why.
- 4 Mr. Chairman.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I want to concur with
- 7 Senator Roberti. I think it is absolutely critical that
- 8 we target a campaign. I would like to offer a little bit
- 9 of direction. I think this Board has been incredibly
- 10 successful in implementing regulations, working in
- 11 partnerships with all the stakeholders, identifying
- 12 problems.
- 13 We know that in our AB 939 report that
- 14 we've gone from 2,000 programs in all the local
- 15 jurisdictions to over 7,000 in all the jurisdictions. We
- 16 hear people come in for biennial reviews and there is one
- 17 component that is always talked about, and that is there
- 18 are no markets. It affects our ability to afford
- 19 programs, and that's absolutely the one piece that we have
- 20 not been able to fulfill. That's why we are so involved
- 21 in America Recycles. That's why we're so involved in the
- 22 Chairman's huge push within government agencies. That's
- 23 why we have to have markets.
- 24 The one key to that, though, is today we
- 25 were talking about the commercial waste stream in some

- 1 jurisdictions. That's the one you get.
- 2 You can do a -- what we haven't done
- 3 successfully, I don't think, is tied putting a bottle, a
- 4 can or a newspaper at the curb into what that material
- 5 gets used as in its second use and third use. We never
- 6 tie that when you throw out a bunch of beer cans to be
- 7 recycled, they come back in four weeks as beer cans, a
- 8 hundred percent recycled content. Toilet paper, just a
- 9 myriad of products that are in the stores that people
- 10 never know are made with recycled content.
- 11 If we did a targeted media campaign that
- 12 talked about the issue of putting it at the curb, where
- 13 does it go, this is where it ends up, buy recycle, not
- 14 just close the loop, but if --
- 15 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: I don't know what
- 16 close the loop means. It's a nice phrase for us.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: It's a nice phrase for
- 18 us, but they don't know -- when Ms. Moulton-Patterson had
- 19 to raise rates in Huntington Beach to pay for those
- 20 things, to pay for those, the curbside and the rest of
- 21 those programs, if the material --
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: Opposition research is not
- 23 part --
- 24 (Laughter)
- 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I applauded her

- 1 effort. What, are you kidding me?
- 2 (Laughter)
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: But you know what I
- 4 mean? If market demand for that material was there, the
- 5 material wouldn't go up huge in value but there would be
- 6 markets for it. There would be a demand for that
- 7 material. Consequently, the costs of those operating
- 8 programs in businesses and residences goes down, and that
- 9 is the bottom line here.
- 10 We have such an opportunity because under
- 11 the sponsorship part of this, I was actually going to make
- 12 a suggestion that since I've been the state co-chair for
- 13 two years of California's America Recycles Day, how the
- 14 Board might feel about us trying to draft one of the other
- 15 Board Members, and I mean -- I'm thinking that Board
- 16 Member Linda Moulton-Patterson would be perfect for this
- 17 job -- but that's up for discussion, because that's a
- 18 partnership between the Board and SWANA, but the reason I
- 19 bring it up is through America Recycles Day, the National
- 20 Defense Fund puts out thousands and \$7 million worth of
- 21 advertising about America Recycles Day and buying
- 22 recycled.
- So why not leverage our \$700,000 or
- 24 \$600,000 in real spots for us; not identifying ARD, but
- 25 real buy recycle spots for us that are reinforced between

- 1 midnight and 6:00 in the morning, somebody's show, with an
- 2 EDF thing talking about buying recycled. I just think
- 3 it's the most critical point of where we have to go as an
- 4 agency.
- 5 I think that in the report that I saw, you
- 6 know, letting the legislature and letting the
- 7 administration know about what we do are critical. They
- 8 need to be in a communications plan. I think that we have
- 9 to make more people aware, but I think too much money
- 10 effort has been expended for us not to take advantage of a
- 11 targeted campaign that not only includes the things we've
- 12 talked about here today, but really pushing buy recycle.
- 13 If you notice, when we got the
- 14 presentation, and the presentation was a good
- 15 presentation, but as all the issues went through, it was
- 16 we need to talk about where we are in diversion, where we
- 17 are here, where we are here, what we're doing here, the
- 18 buy recycle. It was down at the bottom of the list. So
- 19 our own actions are indicative of why this thing ain't
- 20 working. It needs to be at the top of the list.
- 21 So that's where I'd like to see this
- 22 targeted, plus I would like people to consider one of our
- 23 fellow Board Members to take my job. I had two years of
- 24 commuting and I didn't see any volunteers last year when I
- 25 asked that somebody else take it.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: But you do such a
- 2 good job.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I appreciate that.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: You do.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Thank you.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any other questions?
- 7 Mr. Frith. Mr. Chandler.
- 8 MR. CHANDLER: I'll be quick, but I think
- 9 on the heels of leveraging the area of partnerships
- 10 referenced, partnerships with industry and local
- 11 government, I think, as Chairman Eaton knows and as Board
- 12 Member Linda Moulton-Patterson knows, we are currently
- 13 sitting on an advisory committee with the Department of
- 14 Conservation. If you want to talk about a major program
- 15 that's going to be dwarfing whatever we can do and putting
- 16 in front of the public a message probably every 30 seconds
- 17 on the radio, it's going to be that \$10 million they're
- 18 about ready to roll out.
- 19 So I would like the contractor to see if we
- 20 can work with them and at least get the last five seconds
- 21 of their 30-second slot to maybe be your punch line of
- 22 markets or however we can find a way to enrich our efforts
- 23 on top of their program that they're going to roll out. I
- 24 think it's worth considering and certainly I would like to
- 25 see the contractor have it in their scope of work to at

- 1 least explore that option, so I would add that --
- 2 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I certainly
- 3 concur with that.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That works for me.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. I have one speaker,
- 6 Mr. Evan Edgar.
- 7 MR. EDGAR: Evan Edgar, CRRC. Good
- 8 afternoon, Chairman and Board Members. We support Senator
- 9 Roberti's idea about the narrow focus. There's a lot of
- 10 messages out there in the integrated waste management
- 11 field but never a message of buying recycled. It is what
- 12 we would recommend as well. We do believe we can parlay
- 13 off other resources out there from America Recycles Day
- 14 has a big buy recycle push and we are tracking what goes
- 15 on at DOC.
- 16 The biggest opportunity we see out there
- 17 has arose with the signing of the Bottle Bill. As
- 18 collectors of plastics 3 through 7, we are collecting a
- 19 lot of materials, and it's only three weeks into the
- 20 program, and we have no markets. With regards to the
- 21 other piece of legislation that did not pass last year, SB
- 22 1110 by Chesbro, that was something that was supposed to
- 23 go hand-in-hand with the Bottle Bill. It didn't work, so
- 24 this year we are kind of stranded with regards to a lot of
- 25 the plastics out there.

- We would like to have a -- we would
- 2 recommend a nice narrow message, parlay off the DOC and
- 3 targeting plastics, and I think that would be very
- 4 successful and we will support this public awareness
- 5 campaign.
- 6 Thank you.
- 7 CHAIRMAN EATON: Wishes?
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I want to know how
- 9 people feel about Linda Moulton-Patterson taking over. I
- 10 actually suggested it to our partners at SWANA and they
- 11 thought it would probably work if the other Board Members
- 12 wanted to do it.
- 13 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: The real question
- 14 is how does she feel about it.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I
- 16 understand it's close by --
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: We'd love to have
- 18 you do that.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: -- but
- 20 maybe we have other volunteers.
- 21 (Laughter)
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: No, no.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: I don't see any.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'd volunteer if
- 25 it would do me any good.

- 1 (Laughter)
- 2 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: No. I
- 3 think it would be exciting. I would love to if my
- 4 colleagues would support it and if Mr. Jones is ready
- 5 to --
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Step down.
- 7 Absolutely. Absolutely. So I'm just taking that as
- 8 everybody nodding; right? Mr. Chairman, I would like --
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Is this you're going away
- 10 speech?
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: It might be. This
- 12 might be my going away speech. You never know. I haven't
- 13 heard anything that says he wants me.
- 14 (Laughter)
- 15 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: But more
- 16 importantly you haven't heard anything that says he
- 17 doesn't want you.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER JONES: That's true. That's
- 19 true.
- 20 Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move adoption of
- 21 Resolution 2000-54 with a targeted message relying on one
- 22 or two items, buying recycled being primary, contractor
- 23 needs to try to leverage through Department of
- 24 Conservation our effort because we have a joint effort
- 25 there, they need to attempt through the Board Members, and

- l that it be a buy recycled message. And I think that's it.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'll second it.
- 3 MR. PECK: Before you vote, can I seek a
- 4 little clarification? You were talking, Mr. Jones, about
- 5 spots by which I assume you meant paid advertising. To do
- 6 four weeks of paid radio spots alone in four major media
- 7 markets getting 100 points, which Mr. Eaton knows very
- 8 well is the minimum that you need to effectively reach
- 9 your audience, will cost \$400,000 if you do it through the
- 10 California Broadcasters' Association. It will cost about
- 11 \$700,000 if you pay retail. Mass media advertising in
- 12 this state is very expensive which is why we did suggest
- 13 that if the Board was interested in that that you consider
- 14 approving a contract up to a certain amount, and then if
- 15 the Board decided later to actually fund those spots, then
- 16 we would be able to move forward.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I think what -- this
- 18 is to put a scope of work for --
- 19 CHAIRMAN EATON: To put it on the street.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: To put it on the
- 21 street, to come to us with their best view of a PR media
- 22 advertising campaign; correct? So I think that they need
- 23 to know that we want to see a buy recycled message, tying
- 24 it into the collection so we can deal with those issues,
- 25 and then maybe one of the -- and to also look at the

- 1 possibilities of working with the Conservation Corps and
- 2 based on the menu that they give us and the options that
- 3 they give us that we could, in fact, buy advertising and
- 4 do this and that, and that seems to be like that would be
- 5 another item.
- 6 First I think what I see here is they need
- 7 to develop a proposal that says this Waste Board has a
- 8 targeted message, what's the best way to get the message
- 9 out, and don't lose sight of the fact that the
- 10 Conservation Corps has gazillions of dollars that they are
- 11 going to have to put into advertising and maybe there's a
- 12 linkage there, but target, let them know it needs to be a
- 13 targeted message to buy recycle. Does that work?
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: You didn't
- 16 get a second?
- 17 CHAIRMAN EATON: Not a second yet.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll
- 19 second it, but I do have one question of John. On task
- 20 four, the contractor shall develop public and private
- 21 partnerships to support outreach programs, do they
- 22 actually do that? I mean --
- MR. FRITH: Oh, yeah. That's one of the
- 24 more effective ways of a public relations campaign as
- 25 opposed to an advertising campaign that you do with

- 1 effective folks. I understand the coalitions, but I want
- 2 you to understand contractors -- it wouldn't be something
- 3 that our staff and our Board Members would be as active as
- 4 you wanted to be in that process as well. As Chris
- 5 mentions, one of the first stages is warm leads or hot
- 6 leads, if you will, where we use our expertise to direct
- 7 the contractor. The contractor would be interested in
- 8 assistance in this effort so they don't want to start from
- 9 square one.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay.
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: So Mr. Jones and
- 12 Ms. Moulton-Patterson seconds that we adopt Resolution
- 13 2000-54 per Mr. Jones's direction with the buy recycled
- 14 message.
- 15 Madam Secretary, please call the roll.
- 16 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 18 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 20 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 22 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 24 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 25 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye. We have two items

- 1 left. We'll take a short ten-minute break and allow the
- 2 court reporter to have some time.
- 3 (Brief recess taken)
- 4 CHAIRMAN EATON: Welcome back. Next item,
- 5 Item Number 50, consideration of approval of award of
- 6 contract for KPMG Peat Marwick, et cetera.
- 7 MS. PACKARD: Good afternoon, Chairman
- 8 Eaton and Board Members. My name is Rubia Packard with
- 9 the Policy and Analysis Office and I'm here to present
- 10 Agenda Item 50 which, as you just said, is consideration
- 11 of approval of award of contract with KPMG Peat Marwick
- 12 for Board-wide information profiles system development and
- 13 financial analysis, fiscal year 99/00, concepts 44 and 72.
- 14 I also have with me John Fitz and Darryl Petker (phonetic)
- 15 from the Office of Management Reporting Systems to assist
- 16 in the event you have questions about this item.
- 17 This agenda item presents for Board
- 18 consideration the award of a California Multiple Award
- 19 Schedules, that's a CMAS contract, for the Board-wide
- 20 information profile system development and financial
- 21 analysis as specified in the scope of work approved by the
- 22 Board yesterday.
- 23 The contract is intended to provide
- 24 assistance and guidance for staff in continuing
- 25 development of California waste stream profiles and

- 1 development of the Board's overall strategy for a
- 2 structure to support a comprehensive knowledge management
- 3 foundation. The contract will also assist the Board's
- 4 current efforts to use existing and future databases to
- 5 provide an accurate, up-to-date and easy-to-use waste
- 6 information system.
- 7 The scope of work being proposed -- the
- 8 scope of work that you approved yesterday and the award
- 9 being proposed for approval today will be performed under
- 10 a CMAS agreement with KPMG Peat Marwick for an amount not
- 11 to exceed \$234,000. The options available to the Board
- 12 are to award the contract for \$234,000 to KPMG Peat
- 13 Marwick to fulfill the scope of work as described and
- 14 adopted yesterday in Agenda Item 49, Resolution 2000-64,
- 15 or to not award the contract.
- 16 Staff recommendation is that the Board
- 17 approve option one and adopt Resolution 2000-65 awarding
- 18 the contract to KPMG Peat Marwick. If you have any
- 19 questions, we'll be happy to answer.
- 20 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions?
- 21 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington.
- 23 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'll move
- 24 adoption of Resolution 2000-65 to approve the award of a
- 25 contract to KPMG Peat Marwick for the worldwide

- 1 information profile systems and development -- and
- 2 financial analysis.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'll second.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Staff
- 5 recommendation one or something like that; is that right?
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Pennington moves and
- 7 Mr. Jones seconds that we adopt Resolution 2000-65. This
- 8 is an award of money, so we cannot substitute the roll
- 9 call.
- 10 If you'll call the roll call, Madam
- 11 Secretary.
- 12 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 14 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 16 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- 18 BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 20 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- MS. PACKARD: Thank you.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Item 51, which I believe
- 24 is the final item on today's agenda, remaining agenda
- 25 item. Madam Secretary, do we have any rolls that need to

- 1 be closed at all? So we're all up-to-date.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 3 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones. I'm sorry.
- 4 You need to be recognized.
- 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: You're sorry I have to
- 6 be recognized?
- 7 (Laughter)
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: As is the audience.
- 9 (Laughter)
- 10 CHAIRMAN EATON: I don't think I can
- 11 prevent that.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I wouldn't touch
- 13 that for a free weekend in Pismo Beach.
- 14 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, in
- 15 discussions with Mr. Frith and others on the item that we
- 16 had on the targeted PR campaign, I think one thing that --
- 17 one of the problems we always fall into is we refer to
- 18 materials made of recycled content as materials that are
- 19 waste. They aren't waste. They're a secondary and a
- 20 tertiary use of the components within a product, and I'd
- 21 like to, as part of the direction here, have this scope of
- 22 work identify -- we need to spin that differently.
- We need to get people to start thinking
- 24 about it that it's not waste. We had that testimony last
- 25 night that he couldn't put plastic in his bottles because

- 1 it was waste. So I think that needs to be part of the
- 2 scope of work to help support that. I just want to know
- 3 how people feel about that, if that makes sense.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I think that
- 5 makes perfect sense.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: We're okay? I just --
- 7 they just needed the direction and I wanted to make sure
- 8 it got clarified. Thanks. Sorry about that.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: So you'll come back with
- 10 the phrase then; right?
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: No, I won't. Some guy
- 12 that works and gets all this money is going to.
- 13 (Laughter)
- 14 CHAIRMAN EATON: Last item, Item Number 51.
- MS. PACKARD: Good afternoon again,
- 16 Chairman Eaton and Board Members. My name is Rubia
- 17 Packard and I'm here to introduce Agenda Item 51,
- 18 consideration of Senate Bill 876 (Escutia) in my acting
- 19 capacity over the legislative office.
- 20 I first of all would like to apologize to
- 21 you for the fact that you did not receive the final
- 22 analysis until today. There were a number of things going
- 23 on with this in this subject area, a lot of potential
- 24 changes in the fiscal information, and so we would like to
- 25 apologize to you for not receiving it until earlier today.

- 1 The analysis that you have before you,
- 2 however, reflects the current status of the discussions on
- 3 the fiscal analysis. Pat Chartrand is here today from the
- 4 legislative office. She will present this item. Byron
- 5 Fitzgerald is here from the Special Waste Division. He
- 6 will be here, too, in case you have questions about the
- 7 tire program or the tire report, and Lynda Williams from
- 8 the Legislative Office is here also in case there are any
- 9 questions in that area.
- 10 So with that, Pat will present the item.
- 12 Mr. Chairman and Members. I'm Pat Chartrand with the
- 13 Board's Legislative and External Affairs Office. I'm here
- 14 today to present an analysis of SB 876 by Senator Escutia
- 15 as proposed to be amended.
- 16 As proposed to be amended, SB 876 would
- 17 increase the tire fee from 25 cents per tire to \$2 per
- 18 tire and specify how the Board is to expend the revenues
- 19 generated by the fee. This would result in an annual
- 20 revenue increase of \$35 million, bringing the total
- 21 program funding to approximately \$40 million annually.
- 22 The bill would also delete the repeal of
- 23 the fee on January 1st, 2001. It would provide for a
- 24 continuous appropriation of tire fund monies to the Waste
- 25 Board and would revise the definition of waste tire. It

- 1 would add other definitions designed to provide regulatory
- 2 relief for several thousand tire dealers. It would
- 3 require the Board to implement by June 30th, 2001 a
- 4 revised tire manifest system, and it would make changes to
- 5 the waste tire hauler and waste tire facility permit
- 6 programs to strengthen enforcement.
- 7 This concludes my presentation. You know
- 8 who's here to help answer questions. It's all yours.
- 9 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions?
- 10 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Just --
- 11 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure. Mr. Pennington.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Thank you,
- 13 Mr. Chairman. The tire fee will go from 25 cents to \$2,
- 14 and did you say that it would change again in 2001?
- MS. CHARTRAND: No. The way the bill is
- 16 written now, I said it would delete the repeal of the fee
- 17 on January 1, 2001, which is the current law.
- 18 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Okay. So it
- 19 would go on.
- 20 MS. CHARTRAND: Yes.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Okay.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: Okay. Hearing none, I
- 23 have one speaker, Mr. Terry Leveille.
- 24 MR. LEVEILLE: Mr. Chairman and Board
- 25 Members, Terry Leveille here. I occasionally represent

- 1 the Southern California Tire Dealers' Association before
- 2 this Board and the legislature. However, at this point
- 3 the Southern California Tire Dealers are working with
- 4 Senator Escutia.
- 5 Their concern is with the -- where the fee
- 6 collection is taking place, and they would like to see it
- 7 go back to the Department of Motor Vehicles, vehicle
- 8 registration. I'm not here to argue that issue. That's
- 9 really something with the Executive Director down there
- 10 and Senator Escutia, and I don't think that has much of a
- 11 hope of changing, but I just thought I would offer some
- 12 observations apart from the Tire Dealers' Association,
- 13 from my six years watching the tire waste tire issues,
- 14 both on the Board working as an advisor to the Board and
- 15 as an independent consultant.
- I think it's going to be -- and I don't
- 17 know how you feel about it, but I think it's going to be a
- 18 hard sell, the \$2 fee, particularly when you're looking at
- 19 allocating half the money for cleanup, permitting and
- 20 enforcement. Right now, as far as I can see -- and your
- 21 staff has better figures than I do -- but we're talking
- 22 about in the neighborhood of about a million to two
- 23 million tires out there that need to be cleaned up.
- I know it's an ongoing problem. I know
- 25 that tire piles are going to be discovered from time to

- 1 time. I know there's some unfinished issues regarding the
- 2 Tracy fire and the Filbin fire, but thinking of throwing
- 3 \$20 million at a couple million tires is going to be --
- 4 we're talking year after year. We're talking a pretty
- 5 hard sell there. I would think -- and just off the top of
- 6 my head a suggestion is that if you just increase the fee
- 7 to say 75 cents, you could allocate about a quarter of
- 8 that, which is about \$5 million a year, just to the
- 9 cleanup and permitting and enforcement and probably have a
- 10 pretty good program.
- I think the Board's done, despite the fact,
- 12 the Board and fires have done a great job on reducing the
- 13 number of illegal piles out there, and I'd like to see
- 14 down the line obviously that the Board devolving some of
- 15 the power of permitting and enforcement to the lower
- 16 powers and I think that could be done with a little bit of
- 17 an increase in the fee.
- 18 CHAIRMAN EATON: I can assure you after
- 19 this morning's hearing that the Board would probably be in
- 20 agreement with you if it had to do with those types of
- 21 hearings, because those types of issues -- and I'm not
- 22 being facetious, but those types of issues that deal with
- 23 local types of issues and deal with planning permits and
- 24 those kinds of things are a very appropriate thing. I'm
- 25 not being facetious.

- MR. LEVEILLE: Something to really look at,
- 2 you know, as -- after this -- and I assume this bill will
- 3 pass in one form or another and there is a need for
- 4 change, there is a need for correction obviously, but it's
- 5 certainly something that should be on a priority of the
- 6 special waste unit of figuring out ways to get that kind
- 7 of effort down at the local level, and particularly even
- 8 cleaning up the tire piles and whether it's through grants
- 9 or some other way.
- 10 I had a couple of issues on the -- some of
- 11 the specifics. On page 9, number 21, you talk about the
- 12 increased number of tires that can be transported at any
- 13 one time from five to ten. That's a proposal which I
- 14 agree with. I think it should be increased to ten, but I
- 15 think by law you can only transport four tires. If you go
- 16 to five right now, you have to get a waste tire hauler
- 17 permit. So I think it's a minor correction in there, but
- 18 I may be wrong. As I recall, you can transport four tires
- 19 right now without getting a permit.
- On that same page, number 24, and I just
- 21 had, as you guys had, half an hour to look at this thing,
- 22 but I think you should look at the -- when we're talking
- 23 about waste tire haulers, as we've seen today's issue, I
- 24 think there should be some look at -- whether it's going
- 25 to be in this bill or the Cardoza bill -- expanding the

- 1 powers of the State so that a hauler who gets a permit
- 2 revoked should not be able to haul tires under another
- 3 permit, another registration permit, whether that permit
- 4 is his sister or his mother or something like that. Right
- 5 now that's a problem. I think that's something, as I say,
- 6 if this goes into the Cardoza bill, it certainly should be
- 7 dealt with there and working with your Legal Office to try
- 8 and figure out some way that that kind of loophole in the
- 9 law can be closed.
- 10 I think there also needs to be -- one of
- 11 the issues that I still am a little bit confused about is
- 12 if you are -- if a person like Mr. Ball starts a civil
- 13 engineering project, what he calls a civil engineering
- 14 project, and he's diverted to the local government to get
- 15 a conditional use permit for that, I still don't know if
- 16 the Board requires them to get a waste tire facility
- 17 permit if he's going to move tires to the facility and use
- 18 them for civil engineering. I think that needs to be
- 19 cleared up. It's a fuzzy, gray area. Obviously I don't
- 20 think that's necessarily an issue maybe for this bill, but
- 21 it certainly should be a subject for some policy
- 22 discussion.
- On page 10, number 27, this is the -- this
- 24 is once again dealing with the manifest, "Require the
- 25 processor, " the second sentence, "Require the processor to

- 1 return a copy of the manifest to the State or its designee
- 2 within 14 days." I think that's a good idea, but I think
- 3 you have to expand the term "processor" to include the
- 4 landfill, to include recyclers, to include an end user or
- 5 whatever.
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: So that would be the
- 7 definition of what constitutes a processor.
- 8 MR. LEVEILLE: I think you need to expand
- 9 that a little bit to make it a little bit more clear.
- 10 I think as -- once again I'll state when
- 11 you've got intent language on page 11 about the fact that
- 12 waste tire stockpiles and the adverse effects of improper
- 13 stock piles and fires will continue to grow, I think
- 14 you're overstating the issue. It might have been a year
- 15 ago. I think the Board has done a very good job in terms
- 16 of cleaning up tires. I don't think the problem is going
- 17 to grow, I think the problem is going to diminish as the
- 18 Board continues with its programs.
- 19 It's got a couple million dollars allocated
- 20 for next year's -- or for this year's cleanup contract,
- 21 the new one that hasn't been led yet, with a 25 cents.
- 22 Even with the 25 cents, you're talking a couple million
- 23 dollars a year just to clean up tire piles. I think it's
- 24 worked pretty good for as little money as the State has
- 25 had.

- 1 Page 12, right at the top, your comments on
- 2 the tire fee. "The two-year objective of removing all
- 3 tire piles over 5,000 can be accomplished only through
- 4 increasing the funding. Raising the fee from 25 cents to
- 5 \$2 equates to a \$40 million annual tire program." Once
- 6 again, I think you're overdrawing the problem and it's
- 7 going to be -- when legislators ask how many tires are
- 8 there out there, I think it's a hard sell. I think it's
- 9 going to be a hard sell and I think you have to relook at
- 10 that or at least get some very good figures and maybe
- 11 expand what you consider a tire pile.
- 12 Finally, I was taken a little aback by the
- 13 proposal on how you divvy up the tire fund on the back
- 14 page, page 15. You're basically throwing out there 104
- 15 percent or something like that. It's over a hundred
- 16 percent. You explain it exceeds 100 percent to allow for
- 17 flexibility. Just my own thinking, why go down into all
- 18 these details? Why not just maybe make three
- 19 categories -- one for administration, one for permitting
- 20 and enforcement including cleanups, and one for market
- 21 development -- and just make two or three categories and
- 22 then you -- and making it a hundred percent and then
- 23 you've got that flexibility.
- 24 You could have the flexibility.
- 25 Environmental service and technology development I can see

- 1 is a part of market development under the broad aegis of
- 2 market development. I just wonder if people will look
- 3 askance at something that equates to over a hundred
- 4 percent when you're talking about divvying up the tire
- 5 fee.
- 6 The 10 percent for public education, \$4
- 7 million we're talking about, approximately. Tire dealers'
- 8 associations throughout the state are going to say hey,
- 9 give us some brochures and we'll make sure that every tire
- 10 dealer in the state gives every customer a brochure and we
- 11 can do it for \$40,000. Fold that into a larger thing
- 12 under market development. This is going to be -- this is
- 13 going to be a target and I think you're going to run into
- 14 some problems with the legislators, with recalcitrant
- 15 legislators who may balk at the entire fee itself.
- 16 What are we talking about here? What is
- 17 public education? Is it tell people to inflate their tire
- 18 properly? Tell people to take their tires to a registered
- 19 hauler? Most people, you know, really their activities as
- 20 far as tires go they take them to COSTCO or an independent
- 21 tire dealer, they get four new tires and pay a buck or two
- 22 bucks a tire to the tire dealer and that's all they have
- 23 to do with them. Usually the tire dealer will give them a
- 24 little thing on how to inflate properly and that's the
- 25 best way you can make your tires last longer.

- I think that you really might want to take
- 2 a look at that specific section and think about making it
- 3 a little simpler and making yourself less a target for
- 4 wondering how we can get over a hundred percent for that
- 5 thing.
- 6 That's really as much as I wanted to say.
- 7 I think that the overall tenor of the bill is very good.
- 8 Obviously the AB 117 report had some great ideas and it's
- 9 still going to be an uphill battle in the legislature.
- 10 Once there is an agreement with the fee, I think it will
- 11 be a lot easier, but as long as that \$2 fee is in there,
- 12 it's going to be a real tough sell at this point.
- 13 CHAIRMAN EATON: Any questions?
- MR. LEVEILLE: Thank you.
- 15 CHAIRMAN EATON: Thank you for your keen
- 16 observations, and I think that a lot of that should be
- 17 incorporated. I know that you'll be a part of that
- 18 process if and when it moves to downtown, and I look
- 19 forward to doing those things, as well as I think all of
- 20 the other Board Members who will be participating as well
- 21 in some of those. Hopefully you'll have an opportunity to
- 22 read the analysis later on and be able to communicate back
- 23 to us any additional comments. It will be greatly
- 24 appreciated.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Mr. Chairman, one

- 1 comment that I would like to make.
- 2 CHAIRMAN EATON: Sure. Mr. Pennington.
- 3 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I understood that
- 4 Mr. Leveille said -- he was suggesting that the tire
- 5 problem be handled at the local level as opposed to the
- 6 state level. I think we've got quite a few good examples
- 7 of where local level has not dealt with the tire problem
- 8 in a very good manner, so I'm not sure that I think the
- 9 local level is the right level for it. Certainly two
- 10 jurisdictions that had major fires.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Are the poster
- 12 children?
- 13 (Laughter)
- 14 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Poster children
- 15 for not accepting local government to do it.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: On the other hand there's
- 17 a bit of truth that in that way the local officials have
- 18 dealt with it.
- 19 BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: They dealt with it.
- 20 (Laughter)
- 21 CHAIRMAN EATON: Exactly.
- 22 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman.
- 23 CHAIRMAN EATON: Mr. Jones.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I think Mr. Leveille
- 25 brings up a lot of good points. I think that we do need

- 1 to include a discussion about identifying a hauler that
- 2 has a permit revoked and the -- how do we track where that
- 3 hauler is going to end up. We're dealing with that with
- 4 some others. I don't know the logistics of how that can
- 5 work legally, but I think that's critical.
- I think the other thing, too, number 27 on
- 7 page 10, when it talks about the generator and the end
- 8 user, we've had discussions. My office has had
- 9 discussions with people on the manifest system. If you
- 10 remember originally in 117 when I brought up the idea, I
- 11 think it's critical that this needs to be expanded to be
- 12 the generator, the hauler and the end user, and then that
- 13 goes to the heart of what Mr. Leveille is talking about.
- 14 Right now there is an issue as to just how
- 15 many tires are out there. We've seen the number vary
- 16 depending upon who's counting or what the fires have
- 17 consumed. We don't have an accurate number. We're not
- 18 going to have an accurate number unless we come up with a
- 19 manifest system that more closely defines it, and then we
- 20 will have an accurate number.
- 21 We need to sell the idea of that
- 22 three-piece manifest not only on the permitting side,
- 23 market development side, but also on quantifying the
- 24 extent of the problem on where our market development and
- 25 permitting need to be focused, but it will give us the

- 1 mechanism to determine once and for all how many tires are
- 2 out there on the road in commerce, that and once it's
- 3 implemented and operating for a while may have an impact
- 4 on the fee and what that appropriate level of funding is
- 5 once we know the information. Got it?
- 6 CHAIRMAN EATON: Absolutely. All right.
- 7 With respect to that, I would move that we adopt to
- 8 support position, but also in addition ask that staff to
- 9 continue to come back and keep us informed on some of the
- 10 other issues that have been raised as the bill begins to
- 11 move through. And I think it's going to take some time
- 12 yet before it's actually heard, but I think at least it
- 13 would have the Board and give the author the necessary
- 14 support that she needs to begin the process.
- 15 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: I'll second.
- 16 CHAIRMAN EATON: All right. Mr. Eaton
- 17 moves and Mr. Pennington seconds that we adopt a support
- 18 position with regard to Senate Bill 876.
- 19 Madam Secretary, would you please call the
- 20 roll.
- 21 BOARD SECRETARY: Board Members Jones.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: Aye.
- 23 BOARD SECRETARY: Moulton-Patterson.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.
- 25 BOARD SECRETARY: Pennington.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER PENNINGTON: Aye.
- BOARD SECRETARY: Roberti.
- BOARD MEMBER ROBERTI: Aye.
- 4 BOARD SECRETARY: Chairman Eaton.
- 5 CHAIRMAN EATON: Aye.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Mr. Chairman, one
- 7 question on that motion. Terry's idea of breaking this
- 8 into three categories instead of specifically listing
- 9 funding would allow us to put research and development in
- 10 there and a few other things to leave it in broader
- 11 categories, does that make sense?
- 12 CHAIRMAN EATON: Well, yeah. Part of that
- 13 is one we will raise with the author's office and that's
- 14 one of the things for the director to go back through. I
- 15 think that's going to be some of the categories. I think
- 16 no doubt that they will pretty much dictate some of that
- 17 and I think Mr. Leveille's observations that they will
- 18 inquire with a fine tooth comb as to those categories and
- 19 percentages and appropriate levels will take place in the
- 20 ongoing process.
- 21 BOARD MEMBER JONES: Got it.
- 22 CHAIRMAN EATON: That having completed all
- 23 the other items, I will ask if there's any members of the
- 24 public who wish to comment during our public comment
- 25 period. Hearing none, seeing none, then this January

2 closed session, and thank you very much for your two days 3 of long and hard work. 4 One other thing I should mention just 5 before closing is that as you know, next month we are 6 scheduled to go to Santa Clarita. Due to a number of 7 items that are going to be on the agenda, as well as Board 8 Member commitments and other things, we will now just change that from going to Santa Clarita in February and actually go in March. So therefore a lot of those items of jurisdictions that are going to be before us can attend 11 12 the meeting as well. So we'll just reverse those two, and 13 that notice is going to go out, as I understand it, 14 tomorrow. 15 All right. Thank you. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1 meeting stands adjourned. Board Members, we have a short

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	
3	
4	I, Terri L. Emery, CSR 11598, a Certified
5	Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of California, do
6	hereby certify:
7	That the foregoing proceedings were taken
8	down by me in shorthand at the time and place named
9	therein and was thereafter transcribed under my
10	supervision; that this transcript contains a full, true
11	and correct record of the proceedings which took place at
12	the time and place set forth in the caption hereto.
13	
14	
15	I further certify that I have no interest
16	in the event of the action.
17	
18	
19	EXECUTED this 25th day of February, 2000.
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	Terri L. Emery
25	